

PERCEPTIONS OF HIGH SCHOOL CHOIR TEACHERS IN IMPLEMENTING
MARZANO'S PRACTICES IN THE MUSIC CLASSROOM

by

Chelsea Marie Brinda

Submitted to the faculty of the
Jacobs School of Music in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree,
Master of Music Education
Indiana University
May 2020

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

Accepted by the faculty of the
Indiana University Jacobs School of Music,
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree
Master of Music Education

Patrice Madura Ward-Steinman, Chair

Peter Miksza

Lauren Kapalka Richerme

**Perceptions of High School Choir Teachers in Implementing Marzano's Practices in
the Music Classroom**

The state of education has gone through changes as new policies have been implemented to try to improve student performance and teacher accountability. But these implementation processes may affect high school choir teachers differently than the typical core teacher. The purpose of this study was to explore high school choral teachers' perceptions of policy implementation based on Robert Marzano's theories. This qualitative study aimed to address whether the policy changed the teachers' previous methods of instruction, what the teachers perceived as benefits, drawbacks, or challenges, and how they were supported through the implementation process. Through semi-structured interviews, two participants identified changes, attitudes, and perceptions that occurred as a result of the implementation. Both identified major changes in teacher evaluation that included aspects such as teacher pay and student assessment. Additionally, they suggested that administrative support played a large role in whether or not the policy outcomes were successful. The results of the study support research that clear communication and support from administration is paramount to successful implementation. Furthermore, the study raised questions about the efficacy of teacher evaluation procedures and the usefulness of broad goals across all subjects.

Table of Contents

Perceptions of High School Choir Teachers in Implementing Marzano’s Practices in the Music Classroom	iii
Table of Contents	iv
List of Appendices	v
Chapter I: Statement of the Problem.....	1
Chapter II: Review of Related Literature.....	12
Chapter III: Methodology	40
Chapter IV: Results and Discussion	45
Research Question 1: To what extent did the implementation of Marzano’s philosophies change these choral teachers’ previous methods of instruction?	46
Research Question 2: What do these choral teachers perceive as the benefits and drawbacks of implementing this policy?.....	55
Research Question 3: What challenges did these music educators face during the policy implementation process?	57
Research Question 4: How were they supported through the policy implementation process?	59
Chapter V: Summary, Conclusions, Implications, and Recommendations	64
Summary	64
References.....	73

List of Appendices

Appendix A: Recruitment Materials	78
Appendix B: Interview Questions.....	79
Appendix C: Artifacts	81
Appendix D: Codes and Categories	84

Chapter I: Statement of the Problem

Rationale

As new challenges arise in education, policy-makers, politicians, and teachers work to make schooling more fruitful for students. Notable policies from the last 20 years include No Child Left Behind (NCLB) of 2002, Race to the Top of 2009, Common Core of 2010, and Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015. Standards for music, such as the National Music Standards (1994) and National Core Arts Standards (2014) have also been adopted. As the new policies have been adopted, researchers have studied how and to what extent they have impacted general education programs (Boyd et al, 2010; Bristo, 2010; Coburn, Hill, & Spillane, 2016; Coulter, 2013; Keaveny, 2013; Vekeman et al, 2015) and music education programs (Abril & Bannerman, 2014; Abril & Gault, 2008; Aguilar, 2011; Bell, 2003; Beveridge, 2010; Byo, 1999; Ciorba & McLay, 2010; Elpus, 2013; Elpus, 2014; Gerrity, 2009; Heffner, 2007; Hourigan, 2011; Kos, 2007; Spohn, 2008). As policy is discussed, many issues arise such as (but are not limited to): accountability, teacher evaluation, curriculum, planning, teacher retention, administrative support, and student assessment.

It is important to consider why new policies are implemented and how the policy-makers come to decisions regarding what teachers should and should not be teaching. Aguilar (2011) conducted a case study on the National Standards for Music Education, the Arts as a Core Subject in NCLB, and the Arts Report Card. She found that policy and policy recommendations have done little to influence a change in the status of music education. Furthermore, the study revealed that perceived marginalization of music education was one of the underlying reasons for its inclusion in federal policy changes.

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

This investigation suggests a reason to investigate other policies that may be impacting schools and music programs across the country.

Before focusing on the music classroom, it is necessary to look at the process of policy implementation and how it is discussed in terms of the general classroom. Boyd et al. (2010) discovered that administrative support is an important factor for teachers; specifically, for schools to retain their teachers. Furthermore, they suggested that policies aimed at improving administration may be effective at reducing teacher attrition and turnover. Bristo (2010) examined teacher and faculty perceptions of change and implementation of a new policy in Florida classrooms. He discovered that there was confusion regarding the necessity of change and that discrepancies existed between teachers and administrators concerning new procedures involved in the change. Vekeman et al (2015) found similar results in her research of Flemish school teachers. The study revealed that the teachers were more likely to accept and support new teacher evaluation methods when their principals communicated goals and support. The issue of disconnect between faculty and administrative support may be a possible consequence of new policy implementation.

Research specifically regarding music education programs showed that issues of faculty and administrative support also exist in this area. Abril and Bannerman (2014) found that school administration had a positive effect on elementary school music classrooms. That suggests a need for support and communication between teachers and administrators. Similarly, Ciorba and McLay (2010) found that programs with little communication between teachers and administrators were more likely to be at risk of elimination. To alleviate that risk, communication of goals and expectations must take

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

place. Abril and Gault (2008) had principals identify whether or not their music programs effectively addressed learning outcomes and broad educational goals during the time of NCLB. Furthermore, principals were asked whether or not the policy and related testing had an impact on their music programs. The researchers stated that the majority of principals noted that NCLB had no effect on their music program. Abril and Gault suggested that as a result, there should be more communication between teachers and decision makers. Through the eyes of these researchers, it is clear that a healthy relationship between teachers and their administrators should exist and this is especially apparent in the case of new policy implementation or policy changes. Without this support, music programs could suffer.

Even in a non-music classroom, policy implementation can be impacted by the extent of administrative support. However, policy implementation may impact other areas of teaching such as assessment, accountability, and classroom management. Coburn, Hill, and Spillane (2016) documented how implementation of policy impacted accountability. They discovered that in the late 20th century, the implementation of standards did not necessarily impact classroom practices as much as policy-makers may have intended. However, when NCLB was implemented at the beginning of the 21st century, extreme pressure and guidelines were placed on schools and teachers; these included increased testing and accountability measures. Although classroom management appears to be a challenge that affects many teachers, other challenges teachers faced included: lack of support from parents and administrators; reduced resources, economy and budget and educational priorities focused on non-test classes. This amalgamation of challenges could be reflective of the negative impact due to new policy implementation.

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

Other studies involving policy implementation cover a broad ground and help determine whether teachers are meeting goals and whether standards are appropriately attainable. Byo (1999) found that certain standards were more difficult to implement than others; these include singing, analyzing music, and connecting music to history and culture. Furthermore, she found that music teachers who were not specially trained to teach music had a much more difficult time than the music specialists. As a result, she noted a need for additional training so that teachers would be more likely to successfully implement the standards. Similarly, Bell (2003) found that in New York State classrooms, 64% of teachers were more likely to change aspects of their teaching as a result of new standards implementation. She also discovered that teachers found some standards more difficult to implement, including: singing alone, improvising, listening, and reading and notating music. Constraints included a lack of a district-wide curriculum, realistic resources, effective strategies, and sample lesson plans. The study revealed a need for more communication between districts and schools in order to properly disseminate standards information.

Additional studies have taken a broader look at how policies including NCLB have directly impacted school music. Heffner (2007) found that as a result of NCLB implementation, arts funding decreased, instructional time was cut, music educators were required to teach other subjects such as reading, and some teaching positions were lost. Spohn (2008) found that in an Ohio school district, NCLB threatened arts education due to cutting class time, more fundraising non-arts subjects, and making changes to curriculum and teaching strategies. Beveridge's (2010) research and discussion of NCLB resulted in similar findings. Her investigation of past research revealed that music classes

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

and scheduling were at risk due to the push to pass standardized tests in order to have positive evaluations for adequate yearly progress. Elpus (2014), in studying course enrollment over the span of 30 years, found that NCLB might be to blame for particular groups of students not enrolling in music classes. He found that although overall enrollment was not affected, vulnerable populations of students, such as Hispanic and those with IEPs, were more affected than other populations.

Kos (2007) looked at two other policies (Wisconsin's revenue caps and Student Achievement Guarantee in Education) in addition to NCLB. He found that music teachers were uninformed about policies and their concerns were not heard. Teachers were also not likely to teach in conjunction with the new policies especially if they went against their own personal teaching beliefs. Kos suggested that there may be a disconnect and an unstable relationship between new policy implementation and teaching. Reasons for the disconnect must be identified so that educators and policy makers can successfully work hand in hand. Gerrity (2009) found that, in Ohio schools, music was deemed the least important subject in school despite having a favorable view by principals, even before NCLB. Following NCLB, the Race to the top (RTTT) initiative became the main force in education policy. The new regulations and expectations had a similar impact as NCLB, according to Hourigan (2011). He found that standardized tests were still in full force and had broad implications for teacher licensure, teacher evaluation, and professional development. The implementation of NCLB put major constraints on school music programs including instructional time being cut short and teachers being expected to incorporate reading and math in their teaching.

A leading researcher in education, Robert Marzano is

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

PhD, cofounder and Chief Academic Officer of Marzano Research in Denver, Colorado. He is a speaker, trainer, and author of more than 50 books and 200 articles. His practical translations of the most current research and theory into classroom strategies are known internationally and widely practiced by both teachers and administrators (Marzano Research, n.d.).

His theories are used for curriculum framework, lesson planning, and teacher evaluation. Some examples of his framework include instructional strategies, strategies for motivating students, the art and science of teaching, reliable and valid assessments, and becoming a reflective teacher. In the context of my study, his theories impacted teacher accountability policy by changing guidelines for assessment, teacher evaluation, self-evaluation, and professional learning communities.

Marzano's evaluation model contains four domains: classroom strategies and behaviors, planning and preparing, reflecting on teaching, and collegiality and professionalism. Each domain has its own lesson segment, elements (60 total across all domains), and design questions (Developing a Passion for Professional Teaching: The Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model, 2013). Elements are scored using a rating scale: (0) Not Using, (1) Beginning, (2) Developing, (3) Applying, and (4) Innovating (The Marzano Focused Teacher Evaluation Model, 2017).

Marzano et al (2005) also outline guidelines for implementation in his book *School Leadership that Works: From Research to Results*. He first outlines 21 responsibilities for school leaders: affirmation, change agent, contingent rewards, communication, culture, discipline, flexibility, ideals/beliefs, input, intellectual stimulation, involvement in curriculum, instruction, and assessment, knowledge of curriculum, instruction, and

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

assessment, monitoring/evaluating, optimizer, order, outreach, relationships, resources, situational awareness, and visibility (pp. 42-43). He also describes factors that underlie the 21 responsibilities: first- (incremental) and second-order (deep) change. All 21 responsibilities were related to first-order change; however, only seven (knowledge of curriculum, instruction, and assessment, optimizer, intellectual stimulation, change agent, monitoring/evaluating, flexibility, and ideals/beliefs) were related to second-order change. Marzano makes clear that principals wanting to implement second-order change should possess those qualities.

Although the theories of Robert Marzano have not been studied in a choral classroom setting, his ideas involving general education have. Specifically, research has been done on the effect of his theories on teacher evaluation. Coulter (2013) examined three models of teacher evaluation, one of which included a model based on Marzano's theories. He found that in addition to the presence of a disconnect between administrators and teachers, the teachers found the changes to be "too cumbersome and unrealistic" (p. 104). While Keaveny (2013) did not necessarily evaluate whether the new method of evaluation worked or not, she identified factors of Marzano's evaluation method that were and were not effective.

While general teaching and music teaching has been discussed, it is important to take a look at secondary and choral music educators' practices in relation to policy. Russell and Austin (2010) surveyed secondary music teachers' assessment practices. They found that the majority of teachers used similar grading systems and assessment guidelines. Additionally, they deduced that music teachers were typically not given guidance from administration on how to assess or grade their students, even when the schools had

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

adopted standards-based curricula. Gumm (1993) surveyed choir teachers in order to analyze and assess teaching styles. His results suggest that there could be a meaningful way to assess choral teachers that is separate from the typical “one-size-fits-all” approach that most evaluation methods embody. Tracy (2002) investigated the impact of student assessment on individual choral students in group settings. She looked at specific factors such as time, enrollment, teacher/student ratio, training, philosophy, politics, and support. She found that the teachers’ philosophy had the greatest impact on assessment while factors such as time, enrollment, and political influence had little impact. Because of this, Tracy referred to political influence as a “nonentity.” This raises a question regarding the impact that policy may have on mandated assessment. Furthermore, it is worth considering to what extent teachers are likely to respond to new policy changes. Once that can be determined, it will be important to see how choral teachers specifically respond in their practices.

Although each previously mentioned federal policy or initiative plays a large role in education reform, it is necessary to discuss Race to the Top (RTTT) of 2009, as its implementation had major implications for the state of Florida. According the U.S. Department of Education, RTTT asked states to advance reforms around four areas: (1) adopting standards and assessments to prepare students to succeed in college and the workplace, (2) building data systems that measure student growth and success, and inform teachers and principals about how they can improve instruction, (3) recruiting, developing, rewarding, and retaining effective teachers and principals, and (4) turning around lowest-achieving schools (Race to the Top Fund, U.S. Department of Education). With this initiative, states competed for grant money. In November of 2010, the county in

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

question in this study began the process of “redeveloping the teacher assessment tools and processes” with the help of teachers, principals, Classroom Teachers Association representatives, and district personnel (OCPS Instructional Evaluation Systems, 2017-2018). In February of 2011, the team began developing their own evaluation instrument until the State of Florida introduced the Marzano Evaluation framework. Throughout the following year, Learning Sciences International, an organization partnered with Robert Marzano, met with the team to monitor implementation. During Round 2 of funding for RTTT, Florida was awarded one of the highest levels of funding, \$700,000,000.

Problem Statement

Through the investigations of federal policies have impacted classrooms, it became clear that studies are needed concerning lesser-known policies and their impact on the arts and music classes. Little is known about Marzano’s theories in general education, their use in a non-general environment, and their usefulness in practice. It is essential to know whether the Marzano policy is one that helps hinders music programs, and to determine which teaching practices are affected, both positively and negatively.

Prior research has shown a desire to focus on how policies have affected general education (Boyd et al, 2010; Bristo, 2010; Coburn, Hill, & Spillane, 2016; Coulter, 2013; Keaveny, 2013; Vekeman et al, 2015) and music programs (Abril & Bannerman, 2014; Abril & Gault, 2008; Aguilar, 2011; Bell, 2003; Beveridge, 2010; Byo, 1999; Ciorba & McLay, 2010; Elpus, 2013; Elpus, 2014; Gerrity, 2009; Heffner, 2007; Hourigan, 2011; Kos, 2007; Spohn, 2008). Furthermore, there is documentation of how policies specifically affect teachers, including retention, teacher evaluation, and administrative support in the general classroom (Boyd et al, 2010; Bristo, 2010; Coulter, 2013; Vekeman et al, 2015). Despite this evidence, however, there is a lack of literature

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

concerning the impact Marzano's theories on teacher evaluation may have on music programs and their teachers. Due to the lack of further literature regarding Marzano's methods, more in-depth investigation is needed. Moreover, because his method is being implemented across all educational areas (general and arts), there is a need for more awareness and observation. By examining his philosophy and the policies being implemented as a result, one can determine the extent to which the policies affect or change teaching practices. Furthermore, by observing music teachers in a Marzano-led teaching environment, light can be shed on the kind of impact that occurs through the addition of such a broadly used (general education and arts education) model.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to explore high school choral teachers' perceptions of policy implementation based on Robert Marzano's theories. The study addressed the following questions:

1. To what extent did the implementation of Marzano's philosophies change these choral teachers' previous methods of instruction?
2. What do these choral teachers perceive as the benefits and drawbacks of implementing this policy?
3. What challenges did these music educators face during the policy implementation process?
4. How were they supported through the policy implementation process?

Delimitations

The sample was limited to two high school choir teachers within a semi-urban county within the southern United States. This study is not intended to represent the whole county's choir program, nor any other music programs within the county.

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

Definition of Terms

Policy implementation: The process in which new practices and requirements are being enacted in the classroom through state, county, or administrative mandates.

Semi-urban: An area where high school enrollment is between 1,000-5,000 students.

Chapter II: Review of Related Literature

The purpose of this study was to explore high school choir teachers' perceptions of policy implementation related to teacher accountability based on Robert Marzano's theories. To obtain a general understanding, I explore literature related to policy implementation and teacher accountability in general education, implementation of Marzano's theories, policy implementation and teacher accountability in the arts and music, and secondary music and choral teaching practices.

General Education – Teacher Accountability

Before delving into how policy implementation may affect the arts and music programs, it was important to take a look at how it has affected education as a whole. Although the arts and general education can be seen as separate entities, there is no doubt that policy implementation has impacted both, sometimes in similar ways.

Vekeman et al (2015) described the former teacher evaluation method in Belgium as being sporadic. However, a new form of evaluation was created that is much more in depth than the previous method. In this method, teachers were evaluated by administration, such as principals or assistant principals. Furthermore, there was an agreement in the job description for that particular teacher. The agreement was described as “an individualized document that describes which tasks a teacher has and how he/she is expected to fulfill these tasks” (p. 131). The teacher received regular feedback (formative) and a performance evaluation (summative). If the teacher received an “unsatisfactory” performance review twice, he or she was fired. However, the new policy was implemented with the intent to appreciate and improve teachers' practices rather than punish them. The researcher analyzed how principals make sense of and implement a

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

new teacher evaluation policy. Vekeman et al, asked questions regarding discrepancies between principals' standards and teacher expectations, how principals responded to these discrepancies, and whether or not discrepancy reduction affected implementation of policy and the extent to which teachers supported implementation.

Teachers and principals were selected from 13 randomly selected Flemish secondary schools. A case study was designed so that the practices could be explored in depth and so that complex interactions could be understood. This took place in the form of semi-structured, open-ended interviews that lasted for one hour on average. Principals were asked about standards for implementing the new teacher evaluation policy and their teachers' reactions to the implementation steps. Teachers were asked about expectations of the implementation; and both principals and teachers were asked about advantages and disadvantages, feasibility, experience with the new system, and possible effects of the teacher evaluation system.

Results showed that principals implemented the new policy in two different ways: formative, or formative and summative. What this meant is that some principals utilized formative standards with summative expectations, formative and summative standards with summative expectations, or formative standards with formative and summative expectations. Some teachers, especially in the summative expectation group, were concerned about the new implementation and wanted to avoid having their teaching practice more controlled. There was also a difference between teachers with summative and formative expectations. Those with summative expectations were more likely to be concerned than those with formative expectations. There tended to be some discrepancy between teachers and principals in terms of why they were being evaluated; principals

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

tended to think of evaluation in a positive way while teachers felt that it was a way for their teaching practices to be more controlled. Results could be split into four different types of policy implementation: full policy implementation supported by teachers, full policy implementation not supported by teachers, partial policy implementation supported by teachers, and no policy implementation. This research suggests that there needs to be more communication and support between teachers and administrators during the implementation of a new policy.

Because Vekeman et al (2015) looked at factors that might impact teacher evaluation, it is important to look at other researchers who have investigated teacher evaluation as well as accountability measurements. Coburn, Hill, and Spillane (2016) aimed to create a research agenda that could be used for the study of policy implementation, a task that they believed to be essential. Some factors driving the push towards a standardized nation included goals for students and accountability. Coburn, Hill, and Spillane noted that implementing standards and changing accountability measurements influenced how teachers taught and how students learned. The 21st century was not the first time we have seen accountability; the movement began in the mid-1990s and although it grew, it was not necessarily positively or negatively perceived. Two challenges arose: understanding how standards and approaches to accountability interacted to influence classroom teaching and learning, and understanding conditions that encouraged or discouraged teacher learning and instructional change. The article described an approach for investigating the interaction of Common Core and the new accountability measures.

In the late 20th century, Coburn et al (2016) claimed that the impact of standards on classroom practices in the 20th century was only modest. Curriculum and tests were not

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

always created to be aligned with the standards. They stated that as a result, classroom implementation failed to reflect policymakers' intent and looked different between classrooms (p. 245). During the early 21st century, No Child Left Behind (NCLB) was implemented and changed many aspects of schooling. Testing and accountability measures increased, and extreme guidelines were placed on schools. While the policy influenced what teachers taught, it did not change how they taught it. Overall, two concepts revolve around these policies: learning processes and power dynamics.

For the proposed research model, Coburn et al (2016) suggested focusing on alignment and accountability for a few reasons: they have been key features in prior research, they have been identified as key features in education policy, and they can reflect learning processes and power dynamics. They came up with four dyads to be tested: weak accountability/low alignment, strong accountability/low alignment, strong accountability/high alignment, and weak accountability/high alignment. A possible way to study these would be to examine states and districts that may be following different instructional/accountability systems. Because implementation of new policy may include new methods of evaluating teachers, it is worth investigating other policies, such as those based on Marzano's theories.

Marzano's Inclusion in General Education Teacher Accountability Standards

To gain a proper understanding of the utilization of Marzano's model in a music setting, it is important to see what kind of work has been done in a general education context. Coulter (2013) examined three models of teacher evaluations that the state of Washington began implementing in 2010. The models were: the Danielson model, Marzano model, and CEL 5D+ (Center for Educational Leadership, Five Dimensions of

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

Teaching and Learning) model. The purpose of the study was to describe how teachers and principals felt towards the new models; specifically, whether they supported them or not. Additionally, the teachers affected by the implementation of these models and their support for the models were not included in the discussion before implementation. The researcher asked questions about the criteria that principals considered when evaluating teacher effectiveness and the level of support teachers and principals had toward the new mandated evaluation instruments.

To gather information, interviews were conducted with teachers ($n = 6$) and principals ($n = 6$) in six school districts over a two-month period. All districts had an equal representation of the three different models. Interviewees were asked open-ended questions ranging from feelings toward previously used evaluation systems, personal description of the current system, and preferences for their own evaluation model. Results showed that, while teachers and principals agreed on a need to change the evaluation system, there were still concerns with the new changes. The author reported that the implementation of new evaluations were, in the words of one teacher, “too cumbersome and unrealistic” (Coulter, 2013, p. 104). Other findings included a sense of disconnect between state policymakers and educators, and a similarity of perspectives between teachers and principals. The author identified future research possibilities as: a state-to-state comparison of teacher evaluations, and a descriptive study about the perceptions of principals and teachers toward state-mandated teacher evaluation instruments.

Like Coulter, others have examined Marzano’s framework of evaluation in order to investigate how effective the teacher evaluations are. Keaveny (2013) examined the practices of a high school leadership team during the first year of a new teacher

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

evaluation system implementation influenced by Marzano's theories. The context for the study occurred within Florida schools as a result of the new Race to the Top initiative.

The purpose was to identify how a high school administration team effectively implemented a new teacher evaluation system. The researcher identified one central research question regarding leadership theories and five subquestions regarding effective policy implementation.

To answer these questions, the researcher developed a 12-question short response questionnaire for the administrative team ($n = 7$) and a 7-question short response survey for the instructional department chairs ($n = 9$). In addition, the 45-question Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire was given to the principal and assistant principals. The questionnaires were designed to evaluate leadership style, practice, and defining elements during implementation of the new Marzano teacher evaluation system. Three department chairs and six administrators completed the questionnaires. Results showed that the use of transformational, visionary, and distributive leadership was used effectively in leading the implementation. Transformational factors included: idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. Visionary themes included: future outcomes, reflective change, and student and teacher success.

Distributive philosophies included: descriptive, illustrative, predictive, and representational leadership. Furthermore, other themes appeared regarding thoughts and feelings toward the Marzano evaluation system; one being a hostile or cautious approach to implementation and the other being an understanding that the learning process throughout implementation was the same for everyone. This suggested that there may be appropriate ways for leaders to enforce and teachers to embrace implementation.

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

Bristo's (2010) purpose was to examine principal and faculty perceptions of change to a Marzano implementation. Specifically, he wanted to know if there were any significant differences in the perceptions regarding implementation between principals and teachers, how principals viewed their actions in implementation, how teachers viewed the actions of principals, and whether or not there were any significant differences between perceived implementation based on school size, urban status, or students' socioeconomic status.

For Bristo's (2010) study, schools from seven districts in Florida were identified as a sample of possible participants. Due to research permissions and issues with contact, only two schools could participate. Two principals and 101 teachers from Small Learning Community schools (a system of organizing schools into smaller groups of students that share common teachers) self-selected to participate. To collect data, the researcher created questionnaires for teachers and principals which asked for reflections on and descriptions of practices for implementing change within the school. Teachers were asked about their perceptions of their principal's behavior using the seven responsibilities outlined by Marzano: knowledge of curriculum, instruction, assessment, optimizer, intellectual stimulation, change agent, monitoring/evaluating, flexibility, and ideals/beliefs.

Results from the two schools showed statistically significant differences between principal and teacher perceptions of the principal's actions. Teacher comments at one school indicated that there was confusion or ignorance about the new procedures. Discrepancies existed between teachers' and principals' mental models of role and performance, and the issues of fairness when considering the decision-making process.

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

Bristo suggested that future research, including an examination of the political climate, would be needed to determine whether or not the climate affected principal and teacher perceptions.

Teacher Accountability in the Arts: No Child Left Behind

It is important to look at other widely-known educational policies. Heffner (2007) investigated the impact of No Child Left Behind on music in schools. Specifically, the purpose was to determine the impact of state testing, school accountability, and the reading and math emphasis on music education. He asked four questions regarding music curriculum, funding, instructional time, and students in regards to the enactment of NCLB.

For this study, district and state arts supervisors ($N = 214$) from 38 states were chosen depending on their knowledge of and interaction with music programs and music educators. A six-section, 25-question survey was created with questions regarding high-stakes test information, the impact of testing on curriculum since 2001, the impact of testing on funding since 2001, the impact of testing on instructional time since 2001, and the impact of testing on music students since 2001. Closed-response, open-ended, and contingency questions were used.

Results showed that 91% of supervisors reported high-stakes testing in their state and that no test was devoted to fine arts. More than 50% of the supervisors reported a decrease in funding for music programs (55%), music classes being interrupted to teach a test item (52%), students needing to drop music for a course in reading or math (77%), decrease in enrollment in music classes (52%). Fewer than 50% of supervisors reported a decrease in number and variety of music classes (38% and 26%, respectively), loss of at

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

least one music teaching position (~47%), music rooms being used as testing rooms resulting in loss of time (31%), music educators being required to teach a reading class (26%), teachers needing to teach before or after school (41%), and giving up planning periods (24%). Suggestions for future research included a closer examination of tests, remedial classes, and advanced classes, and how those interact with music programs.

While No Child Left Behind has itself negatively impacted music programs, Kos (2007) demonstrated that other policies (Wisconsin's revenue caps, Student Achievement Guarantee in Education, and No Child Left Behind) could work in conjunction to impact programs as well. He examined how the implementation of three policies (class size reduction policy, revenue cap policy, and a standards, assessment, and accountability policy) influenced music teacher practices and music programs. Kos identified an overarching research question of, "How have music teachers' practices and music programs in Wisconsin elementary schools changed in the past ten years through direct and indirect policy influences?" (p. 4). In addition, he identified five sub-questions regarding changes associated with the enactment of policy such as teaching practices, music programs, school characteristics, cohesiveness, and implementation of other policies.

Kos examined two schools: a small suburban elementary school and a K-8 urban school with a history of low test scores. To obtain data, Kos used three methods: observations of classrooms and meetings, interviews with teachers and principals, and document analysis of the implementation of policies across the schools.

Results showed that the policies in question did not have any direct effects on music education, but the indirect effects were detrimental. During implementation, music

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

teachers were uninformed about policies and their concerns were not heard. The responders believed that policies were more likely to be implemented when they were perceived positively rather than negatively. Furthermore, not all teachers were likely to teach in conjunction with the new policies, especially if they went against their own personal teaching beliefs. Issues arose between those who had strong versus weak political beliefs. Suggestions for future studies included examining how policy implementation influences the professional nature of teaching and how it impacts what it means to be a music teacher. It is clear that there has been much investigation into how the arts are impacted by the implementation of new policies.

Similar to Kos, Gerrity (2009) identified factors that have impacted music programs but in the state of Ohio; specifically, the impact NCLB had on the state's programs. He asked four questions regarding the attitudes of Ohio principals toward music education, the status of school music programs, the relationship between music program status and academic rating, and the results of pressures associated with NCLB.

Questionnaires were mailed to a random sample of 246 principals and 179 principals responded (73% response rate). The 25-item questionnaire measured attitudes toward music education and used Likert-type as well as open-ended questions. Participants rated items on a scale of 1-6 (*extremely unfavorable* to *extremely favorable*.) Results from the study showed that a majority of principals held favorable attitudes towards music programs with a mean attitudinal score of 25.1; the range of attitudinal scores was "less than 9" (*extremely unfavorable*) to "greater than 32" (*extremely favorable*). However, music was consistently ranked as the least important subject when compared to mathematics, reading, science, social studies, and writing. Due to NCLB, music

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

instructional time was cut shorter than it had been before. This reduction in time caused the status of some music programs to become weaker in “academic emergency” and “academic watch” schools, while resilient schools either retained their music program status or became stronger (p. 88). However, this association was low (Cramer’s $V = 0.15$).

What one can take from this study is that, although music education may be favorably viewed by Ohio principals, there was still disagreement among those principals about whether it was or was not an important subject, regardless of its favorability. It appears that this had been a common thread throughout the state of Ohio since the 1960s, even before the implementation of NCLB (p. 81). One of the troubling findings was the assumption that teachers would incorporate math and reading into their music classes yet many teachers would not have the proper training to make those changes. Overall, Gerrity stated that 43% of Ohio’s music programs weakened in the time since NCLB has been implemented; however, it is not clear whether or not the implementation was a direct cause. If music programs have weakened as a result of new policies being implemented, it suggests a reason to investigate other policies such as those based on Marzano’s theories.

In contrast, Elpus (2014) found that NCLB didn’t have a wide impact on enrollment. He wanted to determine trends in music enrollment from 1982-2009 to see if they were affected by No Child Left Behind. The study was guided by three questions: “What percentage of high school students were enrolled in music courses in aggregate and in the public school subgroups targeted by the NCLB disaggregated accountability provisions?,” “What was the overall effect of NCLB on enrollment rates and trends in

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

public high school music courses?,” and “What was the effect of NCLB on public high school music enrollment rates and trends among the targeted subgroups?”

Elpus tracked and analyzed class enrollment over 30 years by studying transcripts of 10 large high schools. With that information, he estimated “the percentage of each cohort who had enrolled in at least one music course at some point in high school, with a 95% confidence interval, both for the entire population and for the various subgroups targeted by NCLB” (p. 220). To analyze the effect on rates and trends, he estimated causal effects “using repeated measures of the same variables over time” (p. 220).

One of the main findings was that NCLB had no discernible effect on the overall enrollment in music courses. However, by looking at the disaggregated data, Elpus concluded that Hispanic students and students with IEPs were often prevented from enrolling in music classes and NCLB “may have exacerbated the declining trend of fewer ELLs” (p. 228). While he did not know the exact reason for targeting Hispanics and students with IEPs, the findings suggest that these groups of students were more likely to be instructed to take remedial course work in lieu of music courses in order for them to pass standardized tests.

Abril and Gault (2008) intended to uncover opinions regarding the state of secondary school music programs and how principals perceived the value of the program and their curriculum. They asked questions regarding secondary school offerings, requirements, and staffing, and principals’ perceptions of music learning outcomes and broad educational goals.

Principals were given surveys that inquired about program information, learning outcomes, broad educational goals, and effect of the music program. Out of 1,000

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

randomly sampled secondary school principals, 54% ($N = 540$) responded. Principals represented the midwest, south, northeast, and western parts of the United States.

Results indicated that although 98% of schools offered music taught by a specialist, only 34% of schools required music classes to be taken by students. Many principals stated that music wasn't necessarily a requirement, but general fine arts was. Regarding music as a learning outcome and broad educational goal, responses were generally positive. Abril and Gault (2008) noted that "mean scores indicate that No Child Left Behind and standardized tests had the most negative impact on music programs" (p. 74). However, they reported that the majority of principals indicated that those two factors had no effect on their music program. This suggests an odd discrepancy between whether the factors are negatively impactful. Other obstacles stated by principals included: finances, scheduling/time, outside pressures (including testing, legislation, administration, community), staffing, unique characteristics (such as declining enrollment), and facilities/equipment. Overall, the study showed that principals perceive music programs as helpful for students in terms of meeting music and broad educational goals. Notably, music teachers were found to have the greatest positive and negative impact on their programs; negative impact included teacher ineffectiveness.

Beveridge (2010) wanted to discuss the effects of No Child Left Behind (NCLB) on music and the arts in the general curriculum, specifically on how it affected scheduling, professional development, and funding. Because of the new push towards successful adequate yearly progress (AYP), math and reading were at the forefront of funding. Beveridge reported that this was detrimental for arts and other non-tested subjects. Some consequences were the use of existing resources to provide tutoring during or outside of

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

school, the use of stimulus money to pay for tests rather than teachers, a lack of funding to test other subjects, and encouraging or requiring arts teachers to incorporate tested subjects into their curriculums.

NCLB also prioritized tested subjects affecting scheduling by giving those subjects more class time. Additionally, students could be pulled from electives in order to give them tutoring or remediation if they didn't pass their standardized tests. Beveridge lamented that the attitude of electives being a "fun class" or reward would send a message that, "arts do not require skill, knowledge, commitment, or work" (p. 5) and that it undermined the professionalism of teachers.

Generally, Beveridge suggested that more empirical research needs to be done on the long-term effects of NCLB. But unlike other researchers, whose solution has been to put more stock in teacher and administrator feedback, Beveridge implored teachers to seek out financial resources and advocate for themselves for music to receive more attention.

Aguilar (2011) determined that, while music education policy implementation is widely used as a research focus, there was not much literature concerning how policies have been formed. The study was created to help others understand the decision-making process of the Music Educators' National Conference in its response to the 1994 proposed National Standards for Music Education, the Arts as a Core Subject in the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, and the legislative recommendation of the Arts Report Card of 2008. She conducted an investigation to understand the decision-making process for music education in national educational policy. She aimed to answer five questions regarding: an appropriate conceptual model for the analysis of policy recommendations

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

in music education, decision-making processes, and the use of a systematic policy recommendation model in clarifying the decision-making process.

Aguilar (2011) deemed this a case study as its goal was to unpack the proposed policy recommendation analysis model. The model itself attempted to parse five areas for analysis: the target population, the response, alternative solutions, and likely outcomes. To help generate an analysis of the decision-making process, semi-structured interviews were conducted with the MENC Task Force members and members of the National Executive Board of MENC. In addition, Aguilar consulted theoretical models in policy literature. She found that no policy model was able to answer any of the five questions related to the model. Specifically, she found that there was a lack of systematic consideration of the target population: the teachers. The findings revealed the following: the perceived marginalization of music was the underlying reason for responding to and wishing to participate in federal policy, the federal government was the target population (there was concern for meeting stipulations of grants provided by the government), and these policies and policy recommendations did little to influence a change in the national status of music education. The insight into these national policies illuminates the possibility of investigation into others, such as school policies that are reliant on Marzano's theories.

Abril and Bannerman's (2014) purpose was to examine elementary music teachers' perceptions of the factors impacting their programs and teaching positions. In addition, they wanted to see if teachers had taken on actions for their programs or positions. They had four research questions about factors impacting music programs and teaching

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

positions, and which actions, people, or groups may be thought to be effective in impacting the music program.

General music teachers ($N = 374$) were given surveys to determine factors that impact their program or teaching positions. This included micro (school level), meso (school district level), and macro (state and national) level examples. Furthermore, participants were asked the degree to which individuals exert an influence. The last portion of the survey included two open-ended questions that inquired about teachers' greatest obstacles and critical factors for maintaining or improving their program.

Results showed that scheduling, school facilities, school administration, and instructional time had some positive impact on programs. Conversely, budget had some negative impact upon programs and their teaching positions. Strong positive factors were school administrators, scheduling, parents, national/state music standards, and facilities. Factors that had no impact were voters, district arts/music coordinators, evidence-based assessment, school board, national education policies, and standardized testing. This revealed that teachers perceived factors at the micro level to have more of an impact than those at the meso and macro levels. Furthermore, teachers considered themselves the most influential or responsible individuals. As far as meso/macro level factors go, there was a positive impact from networking with other music teachers in their district and the state/national music standards. It is clear that teachers need support at multiple levels. When new policies are implemented, teacher and administrative support can have even greater importance.

Spohn (2008) investigated how NCLB affected an Ohio school district's arts education program and obtained teachers' perspectives on their experiences. Spohn

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

aimed to also address gaps in the research such as: lack of information on funding for arts education and lack of art teachers' perspectives.

Spohn used a multi-faceted research design: quantitative to determine funding and instructional time, and qualitative to interview teachers and analyze their perspectives. To get a well-rounded perspective, she interviewed six educators that spanned elementary through high school and four subjects. She asked questions regarding changes in instructional time, if the curriculum changed, if classroom practices and teaching strategies changed, and if the budget was affected.

Results showed that according to the teachers, instructional time and classroom practices had changed as a result of NCLB. Other themes that emerged were: changes in the curriculum and instructional time, changes in teaching strategies, and challenges to fund arts education. According to teachers, administrators confirmed that "music education would be cut further if test results were inadequate" (p. 5). Among many policy recommendations, Spohn suggests that arts teachers need to be represented more regarding policy decisions:

Administrators and policymakers should not only seek arts educators' views when developing and implementing local policy, but also value their participation and work with them to ensure that state and federal policies are truly improving the learning environment for the arts and not triggering negative side effects (p. 10).

Teacher Accountability in the Arts: Standards and Other Initiatives

To determine how policy can impact and influence the arts, it is helpful to look at historical initiatives and how they can inform current practices and issues. Byo (1999) aimed to determine how well teachers believed they could implement the National

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

Standards. She specifically intended to determine if and how teachers think they have the ability to implement the National Standards. For schools that employ generalists (teachers assigned to teach music) rather than music specialists (those with musical or music teacher training), implementation of the standards could be rather difficult.

Procedures included distribution of surveys for music teachers to respond. Tested variables included: area of instruction as music specialists ($n = 89$) or generalists ($n = 88$) and the national standards. Nine national standards were rated along with seven instructional ratings on a scale of one (*strongly agree*) to five (*strongly disagree*).

Overall, results showed that music specialists responded more positively to the standards than the generalists. Furthermore, specialists tended to respond more positively to standards related to singing, listening/analyzing and evaluating while general teachers tended to respond more positively to understanding relationships between music and other subjects and understanding music in relation to history and culture. Although music specialists felt responsible for teaching all standards, some felt like they were less able to effectively implement six of the nine standards. Byo noted that there was an expressed need for additional training to successfully implement standards. This relates to the current study in the way that teachers need additional support from administration and colleagues when putting new ideas into practice as a result of new policy implementation.

Bell (2003) discussed arts and standards by conducting exploratory research to determine how National Standards were implemented in New York state classrooms and how exposure and participation with the standards in a graduate class affected their teaching. The purpose was to begin dialogue with teachers, to provide data on current

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

implementation, to determine what changes teachers made after a 16-week course devoted to exploring standards, and what resources teachers felt they needed.

A graduate level course was designed for teachers to become more acquainted with standards and implementation in the classroom. Teachers were to study multiple related texts and have discussions based on them. They were asked to demonstrate strategies from one of the texts as well. Towards the end of the semester, each teacher created their own strategy and chose two content areas. After the course, teachers ($N = 14$) were asked to fill out a questionnaire to determine reactions to the National Standards. Questions fit into overarching categories such as: prior exposure to and current awareness of standards, changes instituted in teaching, and implementation of standards.

Results showed that 21% stated that National Music Standards played no role in the teachers' district music program, while 71% of participants indicated that standards were used throughout the district. After the course, 64% of teachers made changes in their present teaching; 14% made no change; and 21% made no change due to the fact that they were already using standards. Twenty-nine percent of teachers made specific changes to their teaching such as "furthering the content" and using singing and analysis. Some teachers (29%) noted that their attitudes changed or that they were made more aware. In the context of the ensemble rehearsal, 29% of teachers noted that it was difficult to incorporate standards into rehearsals because of time constraints. Despite this, 71% of teachers stated that they attempted to incorporate standards into rehearsals. These were accomplished by using evaluation skills, listening, improvising, or composing.

Some standards were identified as being more difficult to implement than others, such as singing alone, improvising, reading and notating music, and listening. The identified

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

constraints were time and experience. In addition to issues regarding standards, some teachers mentioned that they needed certain resources: a music classroom or additional space, instruments or other supplies, realistic resources/effective strategies/sample lesson plans, district-wide curriculum, and increased classroom time. Overall, there seemed to be a clear need for school districts to play a larger role in disseminating standards information. Furthermore, training and knowledge was recommended, extending beyond the teachers. This extra help and support could be very important to teachers when districts decide to implement new policies.

While Bell discussed issues related to National Standards, Elpus' (2013) purpose was to fill the gap in literature regarding how policy was affecting music education; specifically, the Goals 2000 policy. Around the time of implementation there was much controversy; while some were in support of it, others were not. Reasons for this include the political undertones that emerged. It was due to this movement that states were encouraged to adopt their own standards, many of these being based on the National Standards for the Arts.

For the study, Elpus wanted to know the effect of Goals 2000 on the average number of unique music courses offered, the presence of arts course requirements for graduation, and the average number of years of arts courses required. The study gathered a cross-section of data from before and after implementation of Goals 2000. Data from longitudinal studies were used, specifically the High School Effectiveness Study portion of the National Education Longitudinal study of 1988 and the Educational Longitudinal Study of 2002. Results showed that the effects on music courses offered was statistically

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

nonsignificant. Despite this nonsignificant result, schools were more likely to require arts courses for graduation and therefore the number of arts credits required was raised.

The supporters of Goals 2000 stated that deeming arts as a “core subject” would increase awareness and support for them. Elpus’ study aimed to show that “the declaration of the arts as a ‘core’ subject, the drafting of the National Standards, and the subsequent adoption of state arts standards had positive effects in terms of increasing the nation’s high school’s requirements for arts coursework” (p. 22). However, this wasn’t necessarily a direct result of Goals 2000. While Elpus found that new policies were being created and implemented, arts were not always being included in this process.

Ciorba and McLay (2010) determined a need to expand research and identify classroom operations of K-12 music programs in the state of Illinois. The purpose of their study was to “describe Illinois music educators’ self-perceptions of classroom operations using The Whole School Effectiveness Guidelines Survey for Music Programs” (p. 40). They identified two questions: “What are the demographics of the sample as reported by the Whole School Effectiveness Guidelines Survey for Music Programs?” and “How well does the Whole School Effectiveness Guidelines Survey for Music Programs describe the self-perceptions of K-12 music educators regarding the logistics, function, and implementation of their classroom operations?”

Online surveys were distributed in two ways; email and mail. Teachers who could be contacted via email ($N = 1,135$) were given the survey in the fall. Teachers who were contacted via mail ($N = 128$) were also given the survey in the fall after the teachers with email contact completed the survey. Surveys inquired about demographic information and nine composite areas: music educator as leader, clearly stated vision and mission,

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

safe, caring, and orderly environment, high expectations, assessment and monitoring, parents and community involvement, instructional delivery, professional development, and music program culture.

Responses showed that a majority of the highest rated self-reported responses were attributed to teaching effectiveness and leadership qualities. Ciorba and McLay mention that because of the addition of instructional time for language arts and math, music educators may be expected to do more in less time. Other findings included low attributions with communication of goals, expectations, vision, and mission to parents and the rest of the educational community. Music educators should rather be encouraged to discuss these ideas with parents, students, and administrators. Findings from the study highlight a discrepancy between teachers and administrators, which is a relationship that should be more connected especially when involving policy implementation.

Hourigan's (2001) study aimed to outline the policies of Race to the Top (RTTT) (including reform, professional development, and performance pay), to determine how the policies differed from No Child Left Behind (NCLB), and to outline how the changes might have affected arts educators, specifically regarding professional development. Hourigan began by highlighting consequences of NCLB such as focusing on standardized testing, the usage of adequate yearly progress goals, and the need to utilize arts teachers as reading and math instructors. He then described how RTTT was a competition between states to receive grant funding by requiring schools to assess reform in teacher quality, student performance, college-readiness, and the number of charter schools.

One of the major concerns with RTTT was the usage of "data-informed" professional development and how it affected performance pay. The "data" aspect of performance

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

referenced standardized test scores. Hourigan reported that, “teachers who are paid more (as a result of increased performance pay) are more likely to stay in the profession longer” and “productivity will increase and less-skilled teachers will opt out of the profession” (p. 61). Further, he added that Secretary Duncan believed that with a system like this, teachers would hold each other more accountable. In the state of Indiana, Hourigan believed that policy changes were enacted quickly, without consultation from stakeholders, and that the goals of RTTT were misinterpreted. Because of the push to keep and retain teachers, one of the consequences was that, “under the proposed changes, teachers will be able to add a content area to their certification, such as art, music, or special education, without undergoing student teaching in that area or setting foot in a methods course” (p. 62).

All of these factors also impacted professional development. As a result of the desire to improve standardized test scores, teachers could have been forced to receive professional development in teaching math and reading even if it was not their subject area. Because of that, professional development for arts would be at risk for becoming a low priority. To make improvements, Hourigan suggested that evaluation of learning should be “both qualitative and quantitative” and “not be the only tool that is used to determine teacher evaluation, professional development, and pay” (p. 64). Finally, he made clear that education reform needs to include teachers, administrators, and parents. This highlights the important relationship between teachers and those in charge of decision-making. A strong relationship could help avoid the miscommunication of expectations and goals.

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

Secondary Music Teaching Practices

Russell and Austin (2010) studied assessment and grading practices of secondary music teachers (orchestra, band, and choir) in the southwest United States. Additionally, they aimed to compare their results with existing literature and assess contextual or individual factors such as teachers' education, experience, and beliefs. Their guiding questions sought to address what types of school district frameworks and classroom contexts secondary music teachers operate within, which specific assessment grading practices are most commonly used, and whether or not any contextual or individual difference variables influence assessment and grading practices.

Out of the 4,889 surveys that were sent to secondary music teachers who were members of Music Educators National Conference (MENC), 352 were returned and usable. Of the respondents, 52% primarily taught band, 37% primarily taught choir, and 11% primarily taught orchestra. The survey, Secondary School Music Assessment Questionnaire (SSMAQ), which was adapted from a previously developed survey, had three main sections. The first addressed school context or assessment framework, which included school district policies, support, and influence. The second section had respondents identify specific assessment strategies and formats. The third section inquired about the respondents' background and classroom context.

Results showed that the majority of teachers used traditional letter grades and the main attributes in grades were performance, attitude, and attendance. Additionally, the researchers deduced that music teachers were typically not given any guidance from administration on how to assess or grade their students, even when the schools had adopted standards-based curricula; they state, "secondary music teachers are given

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

extraordinary autonomy and little support or guidance in relation to how they assess” (p. 48). Because of this, the researchers suggested that teachers share and evaluate assessment strategies with each other in order to create and maintain effective strategies. While this study does not go far into perspectives on lack of administrator involvement, having that kind of communication and knowledge could be crucial when enacting new policies and procedures.

Choral Teaching Practices

Because the current study focuses on choral teaching environments, it is useful to look at teaching practices over time. Gumm (1993) aimed to develop a comprehensive model of choral music teaching style and a means of assessing the teaching style of secondary choral music directors. His objectives were to determine measurable dimensions of choral music teaching style, to identify the teaching style of groups of choral music directors, to determine the validity of the dimensions and groups, and to develop a reliable and valid self-report instrument for assessing teaching style. To do this, he incorporated prior research in teaching behaviors and additionally addressed dimensions and styles.

Choral directors ($N = 2700$)—2,000 for standardization and 700 for validity—from 50 states and Washington D.C. were sent self-rating instruments that required the subjects to report the frequency with which they use certain teaching behaviors. Gumm chose this particular method because other methods, such as observation and student ratings, could result in a small number of participants or unreliable results. Out of the 2,000 standardization subjects, 475 provided usable results.

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

Results identified ten dimensions and eight were considered valid. Each dimension is a result of a combination of subjective teaching behaviors. Dimensions identified were: student independence, teacher authority, positive learning environment, time efficiency, nonverbal motivation, aesthetic music performance, group dynamics, and music concept learning. Eleven teaching styles were identified: student-centered comprehensive musicianship oriented, teacher-controlled comprehensive musicianship oriented, student/subject matter interaction oriented, task-oriented, music performance oriented, cooperative learning oriented, concept presentation oriented, content oriented, low teacher-involvement oriented, discovery-oriented, and nonfocused low-interaction oriented. Although the results suggest further study on teaching style or student interaction, the results of this study could be used to inform ways administrators can evaluate secondary choral teachers.

While the previous study focused on evaluating choral teachers, it is also useful to delve into practices that may be affected by such as assessment. Tracy (2002) aimed to investigate and describe issues that impact assessment of individual choral students in group settings. Specific factors included time, enrollment, teacher/student ratio, training, philosophy, politics, and support. She asked questions concerning issues of teacher/student ratio, time, training, and philosophy, methods and tools for assessment, training for creating reliable and valid forms of assessment, and how assessment data were used.

Tracy recruited choral directors from the southern division of MENC ($N = 183$) which included the following states: Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia. A

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

survey was created that contained questions related to the research questions. With a total of 22 questions, the topics were: teacher/student ratio, time, enrollment, timing/frequency of assessment, philosophy, training, assessment format, all issues, politics/philosophy combined, and data use.

Overall, Tracy identified the most important finding to be the strong relationship between the teachers' personal philosophy about assessment and their practices. For example, teachers were likely to give assessments prior to a performance with formats including pencil-and-paper and notation. On the other hand, ensemble size, time, enrollment, and political influence had little relationship with assessment practices. Tracy reported that "this suggests that the lack of immediacy of political influence to the day-to-day activities of the choral classroom renders political influence a nonentity" (p. 152). It is curious to imagine that political policies influence assessment so little: when policy and the amount of testing is considered, one might think that political influence would have impacted teaching and assessment more. This finding could suggest several things, a few being that teachers do not have the resources to assess often, or that they do not agree with assessment practices. Assessment is just one of many facets of music teaching. It is important to look at how assessment practices are implemented and to note the possible changes due to policy implementation.

Overall, research regarding the practice of implementing educational policies has been widely reported in initiatives such as No Child Left Behind (Abril & Gault, 2008; Aguilar, 2011; Gerrity, 2009; Heffner, 2007; Kos, 2007), Common Core (Coburn, Hill, & Spillane, 2016), Goals 2000 (Elpus, 2003) and the National Music Standards (Aguilar, 2011; Bell, 2003; Byo, 1999). While there is ample literature related to how

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

implementing new educational policies affects teachers overall, there lies a gap regarding how the implementation may specifically affect the choral classroom and the director.

Furthermore, while the effect of Marzano's theories have been studied in general education contexts (Coulter, 2013; Keaveny, 2013), there is a lack of evidence in support or in opposition of his policies in the realm of arts and music.

Chapter III: Methodology

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to interview and observe teachers to determine the extent to which policy implementation (based on Marzano's theories) changed choral directors' previous methods of instruction and their associated perceptions of benefits and challenges. I conducted a qualitative intrinsic case study (Froehlich & Frierson-Campbell, 2013) in order to gain perspective on the changes in high school choral classrooms as a result of the new policy implementation. I chose a qualitative research design because doing the method allowed me to have a wide variety of exploratory questions to garner and develop thick, rich data.

Participants

For this study, the original goal was to identify six high school choral directors from six different schools in one particular Florida county. The specific county was chosen because of its known use of Marzano techniques, and the convenience of my relationship with teachers in the county. I wanted a variety of experience levels to highlight differences between teachers who experienced the previous policy and teachers who had only experienced the current policy. By having six interviewees, I believed that I could capture differing experiences; although many high schools in the county have similar demographics (for example, all high schools have enrollment of over 1,000 students) (OCPS, 2018) there are stark differences in administrative support, socioeconomic background of students, and age of music programs.

Due to a poor response rate, I could only recruit two high school choral directors from two different schools in the county within Florida that are known to use policies based on Marzano's theories in their lesson planning, curriculum planning, and teacher evaluation.

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

The criterion for participation included being a high school choir director in the chosen county. To choose my sample, I identified all high schools in the county and sent initial invitational emails (See Appendix A) to all teachers who were listed online as teaching choir (not all rosters listed teachers and their departments). I then sent invitational emails to ten teachers from eight schools. Only two teachers responded and I scheduled interviews with them. I sent follow up emails three weeks later to the teachers who had not responded to the initial email. Two months later, I sent a final email to the nonresponding teachers. I changed the subject line of the email (See Appendix A) to include “Marzano” in the title and received many more replies. At that point, two teachers told me they could not participate, one said they could help but never responded to schedule an interview, and another teacher could not be interviewed because of scheduling difficulties.

From the initial email, I was able to connect with two teachers. The first participant (referred to as “Susie”) taught in a large urban high school (School A) with a student enrollment between 2,000 and 3,000. She has taught for 30 years: 15 years in the county and 9 years at the current school. At her school, she is responsible for teaching choir and music theory. The second participant (referred to as “Jack”) taught at a large urban high school (School B) with a student enrollment between 3,000 and 4,000. The high school is a “fine arts magnet” with multiple music faculty on staff. He has taught for 10 years: 4 years in the county and 4 years at the current school. At his school, he is responsible for teaching choir classes.

Data Collection and Analysis

My interview questions were informed by prior experiences and literature. I completed student teaching in the county and, with the help of my previous cooperating

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

teacher, I learned that this policy caused uproar. I consulted with my previous cooperating teacher to identify teaching areas that were affected (evaluation, curriculum, etc.), but ultimately decided to make the questions broad so that I could see exactly how each participant perceived the scope of change as a result of the new policy. The literature helped me to narrow the focus, especially on questions regarding administrative and collegial support. Much of the prior research mentioned discrepancies between teacher and administrator understanding of policy; I wanted to see if that was the case here, as well.

By conducting one-on-one interviews, I was able to develop a deep understanding of the participants' perspectives (Froehlich & Frierson-Campbell, 2013). I also used multiple data sources (observations, interviews, artifact collection), called *triangulation* (Richardson & St. Pierre, 2005) to confirm my understandings.

Interviewing each teacher gave me an opportunity to ask questions that a survey might not necessarily have given me. I made the interview semi-structured so that in addition to providing answers to my interview questions (See Appendix B), the interviewees had an opportunity to elaborate or discuss an issue in-depth. Each interview lasted between 20 and 50 minutes. To make the findings more credible, a follow-up interview was conducted to ask participants to check my analysis and provide additional information as they saw fit (also called *member checking*) (Froehlich & Frierson-Campbell, 2013).

I had also planned to observe classrooms and take field notes as a participant in order to immerse myself in both what the teachers and students were experiencing. Due to scheduling difficulties, I was only able to observe one of the teachers. I observed three

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

classes: a mixed chamber group, a men's chorus, and a women's chorus. The other teacher sent me pictures of her classroom, at her suggestion. The aim of the observation was to note any teaching practices and classroom setup that could have been informed by the new Marzano policies.

In addition to interviews and observations, I examined any relevant artifacts (See Appendix C) that the teachers provided or that were publicly available online. These included texts or resources that teachers were given regarding Marzano and his framework, sample classroom lesson plans, sample teacher deliberate practice plans, sample curricula, a teacher evaluation rubric, photos of their classrooms, and any examples of assessment tools.

To analyze the data, I used QDA Miner Lite, which is a free software with which I could code, annotate, and analyze interviews with ease. I looked for themes across the participants' responses in order to categorize them (Merriam, 1998). Emergent category coding was used to separate all of the data into relevant categories (related to the research questions). This was to ensure that a big picture could be obtained from the data, rather than having two separate responses. Within each category, I found themes, or trends, that explained what that category meant. These themes are the findings. I then took the findings back to the participants to ensure that all of their perspectives were being represented accurately and adequately in the follow-up interview. Each participant was contacted via email and one gave me written feedback to clarify teacher evaluation procedures and unclear language.

Procedures

I submitted an IRB proposal to Indiana University and it was approved on November 6, 2017. Once my participants were self-selected, I requested permission from the

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

teachers to come into the schools to do research. For the first participant, I conducted the interview at a local coffee shop at the convenience of the participant. For the second participant, I spent one day at one school to observe three classes and to conduct the interview with the teacher. Once interviews and observations were completed, data were transcribed and analyzed for emergent patterns. Following this process, member checks took place in follow-up conversations, held at the convenience of each teacher.

Chapter IV: Results and Discussion

This chapter will present the results of the study, structured by research question. For the process of coding, individual sentences from each transcript were taken and summarized in a few words or less (See Appendix D). Following that, I took a more holistic approach and attempted to gather larger ideas in the participants' recounting of specific teaching situations in which they found themselves. Because the interview questions were straightforward and typically asked for specific facts (see Appendix B), I found many of the participants' answers to be candid and without a subjective touch; therefore, in those situations, I did not feel a need to ascribe any sort of code other than a brief summary. However, that does not mean the interviews lacked any emotional moments. Especially when describing specific events, participants often became flustered or deflated. In doing my analysis, I was able to capture and organize concrete ideas (such as what changed or what stayed the same as a result of the Marzano policy) and perceptions and attitudes about it (such as frustrations, hopes, perceived benefits, and drawbacks).

While particular aspects of the interviews will be described in depth later on, it is worth mentioning some overarching themes that became clear over the course of these interviews. Overall, many of the participants' responses were similar in describing changes and challenges regarding the changes to teacher evaluation procedure. For example, both participants were clear that the teacher evaluation method changed or that the factors determining teacher pay were changed over time. Additionally, many of their attitudes overlapped. There was a sense of frustration with the new policies, miscommunication with each respective school's administration, and a lack of clarity

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

regarding expectations. However, it is important to note that these two interviews were vastly different in one striking way; there was either an overall feeling of positivity or negativity towards the new system as a whole. Susie began the interview by saying, “Actually, you’ll find out that I am not against Marzano.” In contrast, Jack said early on, “Marzano be damned.” Throughout the interviews, it was clear that while Susie was critical, she was also accepting. On the other hand, Jack had little interest in conforming his principles with the new method.

Research Question 1: To what extent did the implementation of Marzano’s philosophies change these choral teachers’ previous methods of instruction?

For both participants, their instructional changes greatly impacted the teacher evaluation procedure. This included observation, and pay procedures, as well as self-evaluation, and goals. The participants did not necessarily consider all these to be major changes, but rather a “restructuring” of current teaching practices.

Teacher evaluation and pay procedures.

According to Susie, before the implementation of Marzano’s framework, teachers were evaluated with an IPDP (Individual Professional Development Plan) with a screening/summative observation instrument and pay was not dependent on performance of the teacher nor the students. At the start of Marzano’s framework, teacher pay was based on Instructional Practice (60% - teacher observation by administrator) and Student Growth (40% - how students performed on standardized tests). At the time, these standardized tests (FCAT)¹ evaluated student performance in reading, math, science, and writing, which made teacher assessment difficult for choral teachers, according to Susie:

¹ FCAT: Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test. The FCAT began in 1998 as part of Florida's overall plan to increase student achievement by implementing higher standards. When in full

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

It was first FCAT, and then everybody was supposedly teaching towards the reading, towards the math...and so our individual plans have to do with how you teach reading in your content area. So we were all responsible for those scores. And people said, “Well I don’t even [teach] reading and math, why should I be held accountable for that?”

Because scores on FCAT affected pay for all teachers, they all felt responsible, even if they did not teach a subject that involved math or reading. After the implementation of Marzano, student performance was based on End-of-Course exams, which are state-wide written exams for each subject area. Following the shift to the new evaluation model, the calculations changed. From 2012-2014, the split was 60% Instructional Practice/40% Student Growth. During the 2014 academic year, that shifted to 50%/50%. It was during that time that teachers worried because although they could be excellent teachers, the results from standardized tests may negatively impact their summative evaluations. From 2015 on, the split went to 67% Instructional Practice/33% Student Growth (EOC’s).

Jack provided details about the previous and current classroom teacher observation and evaluation procedures. About the pre-Marzano method, he stated, “The evaluation used to be: is he making eye contact with the kids, is he keeping the kids engaged...it was more about the person-stuff and the classroom management-stuff and the non-measurable.” In describing the new method under Marzano, he stated:

implementation, the FCAT was administered to students in grades 3-11 and consisted of criterion-referenced assessments in mathematics, reading, science, and writing, which measured student progress toward meeting the Sunshine State Standards (SSS) benchmarks. (<http://www.fldoe.org/accountability/assessments/k-12-student-assessment/archive/fcat/>) State Standards (SSS) benchmarks. (<http://www.fldoe.org/accountability/assessments/k-12-student-assessment/archive/fcat/>)

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

Now, Marzano is about: did he ask this? Check this off. If I asked a kid, “What’s this about?” Can they give me the answer? Check off. It’s a lot more like, how do I say...specific. It’s a lot more like...results-oriented, data-driven, rather than the unmeasurable stuff that really makes a good teacher a good teacher. It used to be: you could walk in a classroom and you could know a good teacher when you see it. Now it’s, “Oh, they’re a great teacher, but they didn’t do this, this, this...so therefore their evaluation is...they didn’t do well.” It’s just like when you’re teaching the kids for the test. Instead of teaching them things you think they need, you’re teaching them the way you know they’re gonna score well on and that’s what’s happening with Marzano. Teachers now know what they’re going to be evaluated on.

Based on Jack’s comments, it was clear that he found the new teacher evaluation method to be impersonal, unrealistic, and quantitative. Susie described the previous evaluation system in a similar way:

... [we had a] performance measurement system and it was [based on] frequencies. Frequencies of: “this was an effective teacher versus ineffective teacher.” So there’s effectiveness over here and effectiveness over here and then if you were there [in a certain category], they’d put tallies in different areas. (Appendix C)

Based on their descriptions, each evaluation method had some quantitative aspect, but they seemed to measure different aspects. Although the difference between the two methods was not made entirely clear, Susie explained that she felt the previous method was more focused on the teachers while the new method was more focused on the students; she felt that this change was positive.

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

Differences in teacher evaluation scores affect pay. Susie noted that the weight of FCAT scores on your pay changed over time: “So [when] it was 60% Instructional Practice/40% Student Growth, then that was your score and that’s how you got paid. Then it went to 50%/50% and that’s when a lot of us said, ‘Wait a minute.’” In her follow-up, she added, “We complained because you could be an excellent teacher, but student variables may not yield desired student results.”

She also mentioned specifically that the calculation to determine pay had changed. She went on to specifically discuss how tenure was affected by this:

I think that year when we started, you were no longer given tenure. So now new people hired, as well as all employees, are on annual contracts. I was still tenured because I was just grandfathered in. But my colleague is not. The impact of being tenured is peace of mind that dismissal and due process are there and you are less likely to be laid off, dismissed.

In her follow-up, she made clear that tenure was not a factor of Marzano, but rather a separate change. She added, “I might have tenure, but I could be dismissed if economic circumstances of our country, state, or nation change; it has in the past.”

Jack was more frank about pay. He simply stated, “Their pay depends on it [their evaluation scores] now,” and “I want to get a good evaluation because I want to make more money.”

Student growth and formative assessment.

The implementation of Marzano resulted in new forms of student summative assessments: End-of-Course (EOC) exams. (It is important to note that EOC exams are not part of Marzano’s framework, just a consequence of the policy change). These exams

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

became part of the Student Growth percentage in their evaluations. In comparison to the previously-used standardized tests, EOC exams are much different. Although they are used state-wide, each course and grade level has its own exam, therefore giving elective classes an opportunity to be held accountable in their own subjects rather than reading, math, science, and writing.² In describing the procedure for these new tests, Susie stated:

So now Chorus I, II, III, IV has an exam at the end and it is based on that exam that is your growth [*sic*]. Like I have in concert choir...I have kids that are in 2nd, 3rd, and 4th...so they will take different chorus exams.³

One of Susie's challenges with EOC's was not knowing exactly what would be on each exam. She said:

The first year that that came out, our students did really poorly. And I go, 'I know I'm teaching. What's wrong with this picture?' So it made me go, 'Just generalize what they give you, that's what's gonna be on the test.' So I have changed my way of teaching so that I hit a lot more of this for this year. You can teach the concepts and you can teach the skills. They do give you...these are the things covered, like the standards that are gonna be covered.

One important aspect to note is the expectation and challenge of assessing different subjects (e.g., math and art) with the same evaluation framework. For example, EOCs don't have a performative aspect, which is a large part of music class and the performing arts. Regarding this, Susie noted:

² <http://www.fldoe.org/accountability/assessments/k-12-student-assessment/end-of-course-eoc-assessments/>.

³ Each grade has their own exam, so a freshman in choir will take a different exam than a sophomore, even if they are enrolled in the same choir class.

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

Some of the exhausting things about this is...in addition to Marzano, we also have MPA.⁴ Students might be brainy on paper, but might not be able to perform, to sing well. You know, they might know everything on [out of the] book and present something to you, but skill-wise, they cannot produce it. So for us, a performing aspect is not accounted for on the EOC evaluation.

One can imagine Susie's frustration when considering extra activities that some of these courses are expected to do. Since choir is a performing art, she believes that tests should account for students' performing skills; unfortunately, EOCs only account for written work.

In terms of student formative assessment, Jack stated, "Yeah, I feel like we constantly assess." He went into greater detail while comparing it to other subjects that utilize the same form of evaluation:

But I feel like in here and in band...we do that anyway. Because that's the type of class it is...like in math class, you're not constantly stopping, fixing, stopping, fixing, going back and forth, asking for feedback, giving feedback, assessing every two seconds...and I think that's what Marzano is about...assessment.

Teacher self-evaluation: Deliberate practice.

With the implementation of Marzano came a new way of self-evaluation: deliberate practice. According to Marzano, deliberate practice is, "a way for teachers to grow their expertise through a series of planned action steps, reflections, and collaboration. Involved in the Deliberate Practice Plan are: setting goals, focused practice, focused feedback, observing and discussing teaching, and monitoring progress" (Learning Sciences

⁴ MPA: Music Performance Assessment. Music ensembles perform for three judges and are rated as Superior, Excellent, Good, Fair, and Poor.

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

International, 2012). Susie described the process as: “You take a survey of where you are...and then out of those [elements] that are the lowest, you choose one that you’re gonna deliberately work on.” Jack noted that prior to Marzano, there was a similar procedure called the “Individual Professional Development Plan,” or “IPDP.” Regarding deliberate practice, he described it similarly:

[Before] you [would] say, this is the stuff I’m gonna work on this year and try to better myself and learn. And then you [would] evaluate yourself at the end of the year. Now, you have to go through and pick these Marzano-like domains that you’re gonna focus on this year. And then they come and evaluate you. And when they evaluate you, they’re evaluating whether or not you are hitting your benchmarks you picked at the beginning of the year.

Later on in the interview, he described the process of choosing a domain and how it’s evaluated:

They come and evaluate you on if you’re meeting your deliberate practice that you picked at the beginning of the year. Last year, my deliberate practice was “with-it-ness.” That’s what I picked. Now, “with-it-ness” is, “Am I ‘with it’ enough to notice if a kid is off task?” or, “Do I know what’s going on over there while I’m working over here?” Obviously, I do; they’re all standing in front of me. But I don’t, on a daily basis, go out of my way to make sure I document and address it. But when she [evaluator] is in the room, I sure as heck do. “Hey, what’re you doing? Why are you talking over there? Guys, I need you to focus.” I’m redirecting. Now, there are some days where I don’t want to break my momentum as a teacher and I’ll ignore it. But that [observation] day I don’t.

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

Jack provided criticism of this task and the evaluative value of it, saying that it is “one tiny little piece of what you do all day.”

Rubrics, goals, and objectives in the classroom.

Another instructional addition since Marzano that both participants mentioned was the requirement for rubrics, goals, or objectives. Furthermore, one participant specifically noted that these are always to be posted on display in the classroom. This proved to be both beneficial and challenging in different ways. For Susie, it was good for the students to know what the task and goal was for each day. More specific benefits will be discussed further. However, there were also times when having a rubric seemed inappropriate, unnecessary, and not conducive to the current lesson:

It was one of those days that we’re saying the fundraiser items [*sic*]. They’re giving the spiel about the fundraiser and all of that. And she [evaluator] gave me something... “applying” because the rubric did not match what I was doing. And I go, “Are you kidding?” I was so mad. This is the one day...I mean this rubric over here is for the unit for the week. This is the one day I don’t have [a one-day presentation]. And...she didn’t say, “Oh, I see,” or anything like that. She said, “You should’ve changed the goal and the rubric for that day.”

After this situation occurred, this participant made sure to comply with the strict rubric policy for future observations:

And then from then on, every time there is something...the day after MPA we evaluate [ourselves] and the next day we clean. So I put in the rubric, “I will take pride in our classroom.” And then the rubric is: 1) I do not care, everybody else should clean but not me, 2) I will do one thing for the good of the whole, 3) the goal

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

itself, and then 4) I will go above and beyond and ask for more things that can be done to clean this room.

Jack described his attitude towards this requirement a bit differently:

You can see I don't do it...I'm supposed to have all the learning crap on my board.

The daily "this" and the learning goal and the scales. I don't do any of that. But that's what we're supposed to do.

Further on in the interview, he added:

When they come and observe me, I do write all that crap on the board. And then the next day, I erase it. Because it doesn't mean anything to the kids.

My observations confirmed that neither participant had rubrics or goals in sight in their classroom, suggesting that the addition of rubrics, goals and objectives did not significantly impact their methods of instruction.

Another instructional change for Susie included the addition of PLCs, or Professional Learning Communities. PLCs are defined as, "the groups of teachers who work together to improve student learning" (Collaborative Teams That Transform Schools, n.d.).

Although she acknowledged that a PLC will be different depending on the administrator, she noted that one of the purposes was to have teachers work together to create the same common exams.

Overall, it seems that Susie's and Jack's teaching did not change substantially. There were certainly moments during which they had to make new decisions such as when to change their rubric, whether or not they should write goals on the board, or if a test item should be covered in class. But ultimately, their structural teaching philosophies seemed to go unfazed.

Research Question 2: What do these choral teachers perceive as the benefits and drawbacks of implementing this policy?

Benefits.

There were certain aspects of the implementation that the teachers found beneficial to their teaching. In the case of goal-setting, Susie found that the requirement of posting goals and rubrics was helpful for her students:

For me, a benefit was: although I know what my goal is, now I was telling my students what the goal was. I was telling them so that they'd go, "I don't know anything about it," or, "I already know some of it," or, "I'm already there." Every year they're [the county] asking for different things. I don't put it on the board as much and so I've gotten away from it...once I got used to it, I actually liked it. But if not, it's just things to learn without an ending goal and I think that every human likes to have a purpose for learning.

She continued by noting that this goal-setting system allowed students to evaluate and rate themselves:

If they really do it, it is telling...they're asking them to rate themselves, and if you really listen to that and you adjust the way that you teach, you will get more, or get them to a higher level because you know where to start, where to go, and you should do it throughout the unit so that you know where they are.

At a certain point, she conceded and acknowledged that having the students rating themselves can only get them so far: "But the thing is, you have to teach so much within the year that even if some of them do not attain it, you're gonna have to say, 'Come to tutoring.'"

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

Jack also made note that the new required practices could be beneficial in theory and practice:

There are some benefits. I mean, I think like I said before...I think it's good practice.

If people read the book and looked at what he's talking about and the things he was trying, what his research showed...they're all good things, I mean it's obvious. If you tell a kid what they're supposed to learn before they learn it, then they know what to listen for. It's obvious that they're gonna [understand], y'know what I'm saying?

Writing it on the board...we've been doing that. We'll tell them, "Guys, we're gonna run through this section again, but I want you to really listen for the vowels." So we're telling them up front what they should be learning and listening before we do it. And good teachers have been writing that on the board for years.

Based on these two situations, it becomes clear that this new policy has positively affected their classroom with the addition and enforcement (sometimes reinforcement) of goal-setting responsibilities.

Drawbacks.

While there were positive impacts, implementation of the policy was not without some drawbacks. One of Jack's major difficulties with the implementation had to do with the fact that he believed the profession and act of teaching became more mechanical:

I don't think it's that bad because what we [music teachers] do is Marzano pretty much every day: constant assessment, constant feedback, asking them...but in other subjects, I can see how it might sterilize everything and just make it more data-driven. This kind of stuff and a lot of the intangibles might be ignored. People just start checking off boxes to check boxes off. I think you lose something. You know what I

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

mean? It'd be like doing music without any emotion but you're doing all the dynamics on the page.

Although Susie was generally more positive, she might have agreed with Jack on a few of his points. During her interview, she described the process of lesson planning as, "You have already done this. But now you have to do it differently. I did my own, it's the way that I used to do it, I just add more boxes." However, she probably would have disagreed with calling teaching more mechanical.

Research Question 3: What challenges did these music educators face during the policy implementation process?

During the interview process, the general feel was that implementation proved to be challenging. In some cases, participants felt that they were being instructed to do things they were already doing, but with extra steps or explanations. Sometimes, one of them felt that the act of teaching was "dumbed down" or turned into a formula where certain steps had to be performed and achieved to result in success. Despite this, these challenges did not come without some concessions from both participants regarding the positive impact.

Regarding the idea of doing something with a new method, Susie concisely described their thought process: "How do you do 'hypotheses' in chorus? Oh, I can do this, we do this all the time, we just haven't called it that." Jack had agreed:

A lot of Marzano stuff is like constant feedback, having the kids rank themselves...on a scale of 1 to whatever, "How do you think you did on this assignment?" Here, we do that literally all the time.

Jack later added:

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

The frustration comes when they try to fit the Marzano check boxes they have for all of the core subjects into our stuff and they don't say, "Well, you're already doing this, it's just a different way." It's more like if they would just understand that what we do in here literally lines up perfectly with the Marzano stuff and let it be and like, saw that it works rather than saying, "Oh yeah, I see that you constantly assess, but I need you to constantly assess this way."

In the end, he put it more concisely: "So it's like, you're having to just adapt and fit...what you're doing into the Marzano model."

Jack also found communication challenging when clarifying important terms with their administration and evaluator:

Here, I was "highly effective" last year. Two years before that I was not. And then this year, my first evaluation, I didn't get "innovating," I got "applying." Which is like one level below the highest level. That's how they rate you: are you innovating or are you just applying the stuff? And when I asked my assistant principal why I didn't get "innovating," she didn't give me a straight answer. What's "innovating" supposed to be? That's another part of the problem too, like, we can't even define what "innovating" is. They can't either. So...and I remember the day she came in. The sopranos couldn't...they were singing something wrong or flat, I don't remember. But I told them to do something physically, which I've never told them before, like it just popped in my head. Like today, I said, "Don't sing sharp like my hair, sing like [that student's] hair, nice and poofy." And it worked. So to me, that's "innovating." But the AP who comes in and observes you, she doesn't know if you've never said that before.

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

This particular situation harkens back to the issue Jack brought up earlier: what administrators come and evaluate is just a small fraction of what teachers are actually doing.

Although both participants struggled with the change, they didn't find it impossible. Susie states, "I welcome change. I am not stuck in the past. I keep on listening to new music. So for me, it was hard, but it wasn't an impossible thing to do."

Research Question 4: How were they supported through the policy implementation process?

Both participants noted that for most of the time, they felt supported through colleagues and administration. From their colleagues, much of the support was in the form of "commiseration" or agreeing to not be adaptable. Regarding their administration, they acknowledged that the level of support depended upon the individuals conducting evaluations and in general administrative roles. Furthermore, there were certain situations that teachers found themselves in that didn't speak well to the amount of support their administration provided.

As described earlier, Susie found herself in a bind when a principal criticized her for not changing her rubric on a day where her classes were having a fundraising presentation. She also endured another frustrating situation with her principal regarding the domain of "mentorship." Due to the number of colleges in the state with large music programs, having an intern in the classroom is very common. Susie had an odd encounter when she discovered that her principal didn't realize that they were mentoring a student teacher. Instead of asking her, the principal assumed she wasn't mentoring and thus gave her "applying" for that category:

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

I don't know what mentorship means for Marzano. If having an intern that you're mentoring every single day doesn't count for it...it's not like I'm mentoring once a week and in PLC because I am the chair of that department or that I have done a workshop and I'm preparing for that workshop. It's a day-to-day mentorship. And she [the principal] goes, "Oh, I forgot."

Susie later added, "Unless you ask me, you don't know I have mentors." However, she eventually reversed her decision and stated, "In terms of Marzano, well the fact that I can talk to the principal and tell her, 'you didn't realize I had mentors,' I think is good...depending on what she says." In this case, she felt relieved that she could have an honest conversation with her principal by telling her that she actually did have mentors.

When asked straightforwardly, Susie described other interactions with administration more positively:

I mean, the fact that they gave you books, that they do training, even for the music people...the county has given training and the Fine Arts Coordinator and their team have given training. They have given resources and time. If I need to and I say, "I don't understand this," they'll give me time to go and observe somebody.

Furthermore, she described a situation where her own expertise was used as an example to help other administrators see an effective educator:

I know my principal brought [other] principals to come and observe me because she liked the way that I did the goals and the rubrics. I want them to observe what is [a] real teacher rather than a dog and pony show...that's what she called it. Mine was a process and it wasn't sprung on them just because an administrator was there. So the

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

fact that she also praised me was...it's a good way of saying, "Good job, I see that you're doing it."

For this participant, it seemed that the interaction and relationship between her and her administration had generally been positive. Moreover, the administration seemed more than willing to provide teachers with a supportive environment and physical tools that are necessary to succeed. When asked directly, she said, "Yeah, they have all been supportive."

Jack had a bit of a different perspective because he had experience with Marzano-influenced policies at two different schools. In this instance, he reflected on his old principal in another county who was more into appeasing their employees rather than necessarily following the rules concerning evaluation:

When I was at the old high school I was at in another county, everyone got "highly effective." Everyone. Every single teacher. Because the principal didn't want to deal with teachers coming and complaining that they didn't get their raise...so he would just give out "highly effective" to everybody. And then the county saw that [practically] 98% of our county – because every principal did that – was all highly effective and they're like, "This is a problem 'cause kids are failing all kinds of stuff, they're doing horrible on the FCATs, so you can't all be highly effective." So then the next year, no one got "highly effective."

Concerning their current administration, Jack found that they were supported more because they are good teachers and not necessarily because they followed Marzano. He stated:

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

They know we're going to do our jobs not because we fit Marzano, but because they see our results. The admin here is great and they're like, "Whatever, I don't care that you don't have stuff on the board, just do your job."

Although he felt supported in instances like these, he acknowledged that this may not be the case at any other school. He stated, "Other schools are not like that. It just depends on your admin. And if they walk in and they don't see the stuff on the board, you get dinged right away." When specifically asked if he feels supported by his administration, Jack emphatically stated, "I'm very supported in my choice to ignore it."

As stated earlier, these participants often felt supported by colleagues in their school community. In some cases, colleagues were often more negative about the policy implementation. While Susie welcomed the change with open arms, she found that her coworkers were not as enthusiastic. She was direct in saying that most people will be negative. When describing the teacher union's attitude towards it, she stated, "The teacher's union don't really advocated [*sic*] for it...I think they would like to see it all gone." Concerning the views of coworkers, she said:

People like what they have, they're used to it, so [with] a new system, you have to do something different...prepare your lesson plans like they have for a long time now, especially people that have the same subject; you have already done this. But now you have to do it differently.

She later added:

Most people are negative. Most people don't want change. Many people have gotten used to it. And if you bring another evaluation system, they're going to block that one. I don't know, I can't answer for other people.

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

She followed up that statement by mentioning that some teachers had quit over this.

Jack had similar thoughts. When asked directly if there was an impact on the school community, he said, “Yes. A negative impact. A huge negative impact.”

Chapter V: Summary, Conclusions, Implications, and Recommendations

Summary

The purpose of this study was to explore high school choral teachers' perceptions of policy implementation based on Robert Marzano's theories in order to shed light on whether policy positively or negatively impacted their choir classrooms. The study aimed to answer the following questions:

1. To what extent did the implementation of Marzano's philosophies change these choral teachers' previous methods of instruction?
2. What do these choral teachers perceive as the benefits and drawbacks of implementing this policy?
3. What challenges did these music educators face during the policy implementation process?
4. How were they supported through the policy implementation process?

To answer these questions, I chose to use a qualitative research design. I identified two high school choral directors from two different schools in a large county within the southern United States that is known to use policies based on Marzano's theories in their lesson planning, curriculum planning, and teacher evaluation. I conducted one-on-one interviews using questions that were informed by my own personal prior experiences as well as research literature. Additionally, I observed three choir classes of one participant and obtained photographs of the classroom of the other participant. I also obtained artifacts such as lesson plans and deliberate practice plans.

Following data collection, I transcribed interviews and analyzed them for emergent themes which may or may not have been related to my interview questions. I mostly took

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

a holistic approach due to the objective nature of the interview questions; as a result, most responses were categorized based on interview questions. However, I also found that participants had very strong, and often conflicting, attitudes; this provided an interesting juxtaposition of general perceptions and willingness to adapt to new policy changes prescribed by their school administration.

Interviews revealed that both teachers were affected in similar ways regarding changes in teacher evaluation which included pay, assessment, observation, teacher self-evaluation, classroom set-up, and faculty/administrative support. But the main juxtaposition was their attitude toward the change. Both participants agreed that the changes were often detrimental and challenging, that many of their colleagues were unhappy, and that communication with administration and administrative support was paramount to success; the difference is that one participant had a clearly negative outlook while one had a positive one and took the changes in stride.

Conclusions

Following interviews, a few things became very clear. Most importantly, each participant believed that the Marzano policy was adapted with good intentions; the policy not only gave them opportunities to tell students the goals and objectives, but the new teacher evaluations were more student-focused than teacher-focused. Despite this, they also agreed that while the intent was positive, aspects of the policy could have been more effectively put in place. Additionally, participants clearly stated that communication and support from their administrators was essential for them to understand what was required of them. They also lamented about the general limitations of student assessment and teacher evaluation and how the policy neglected to account for those. In fact, although the policy was thought to be all-encompassing, the interviews really shed light on how much

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

teacher evaluations changed and negatively impacted the teachers. Finally, participants noted that the policy didn't have a major effect on their teaching.

Both participants agreed that aspects of the Marzano policy could have been more effectively implemented. Most of their concerns addressed the changes in the teacher evaluation process. Despite this frustration and the negative impact on attitudes and the school community, neither of the participants mentioned a negative impact on the choral programs themselves, which matches findings from Elpus (2014), Abril and Gault (2008), Kos (2007), and Aguilar (2011) who also found that music programs remained resilient throughout change. This contradicts findings from Heffner (2007), Spohn (2008) Gerrity (2009) who all mentioned that policies had detrimental effects on programs. But reasons for the lack of negative effects could be due to a variety of factors such as the following: the school itself has ample funding, the program has ample funding, the program is in a strong bargaining position, or the program has enough teachers.

This study supports other research (Bristo, 2010; Coulter, 2013) that found that the process of implementing new policy can be confusing, unrealistic, and inconvenient. Some, such as Vekeman et al (2015) and Kos (2007) attributed that to the lack of communication or support from administration, and Abril and Bannerman (2014) made it clear that teachers needed support from their administration. In this study, both participants also made it very clear that support and communication from their administrators were essential in understanding what was required of them. In some cases, administration was unhelpful; Susie suffered miscommunication when she had a student-teacher and Jack received unhelpful feedback when he asked what "innovating" was supposed to mean in the context of an evaluation. Byo (1999) and Bell (2003) found that

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

teachers desired clarification on aspects such as standards information and often desired additional training. Based on each participant's responses, their administrations seemed more than willing to provide additional aid or instruction when they desired it.

Overall, each participant noted that their teaching didn't change much over the course of the implementation; they continued to use their tried and true procedures because they, as well as their administrators, knew that they and their choral programs had been successful in the past. This finding is supported by Tracy (2002) and Kos (2007), the latter of whom made clear that personal teaching beliefs trump policy. While the majority of their teaching didn't change, Susie acknowledged that she often felt the need to "teach to the test" due to yearly end-of-course exams. This aligns with Heffner's (2007) finding that teachers were teaching test items, although those items were more closely related to other subjects such as math and reading.

Implications

This study revealed that although the Marzano policy had some positive features, the process of implementation was not as smooth as it could have been. However, one might wonder if this is a downside with this specific policy, or if it is more of a systemic problem with any new general policy implementation. Since beginning this research, I have started my own career as a choir teacher. As a result, I have a much different perspective specifically on the evaluation process than when I first began this research. My school does not use any Marzano-influenced evaluation method, but rather the Danielson method. Despite that, I have run into similar situations such as misunderstanding expectations, a lack of clarity, and miscommunication with my administration. I can imagine that no matter what teacher evaluation method is used, there may not be a perfect solution.

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

Now that I have completed my interviews, I wish I had asked the teachers, “What is your preferred method?” or “What would you imagine a perfect evaluation framework to look like?” If policy makers wanted to make something like teacher evaluation a more perfect science, I believe there are multiple big, but potentially helpful, changes that could be made such as:

1. Each subject area has its own specific teacher evaluation criteria. As Jack mentioned, one of the differences between music and a core class is how choral music teachers are constantly assessing based on what they hear and see in the rehearsal’s moment. If the chosen policy’s evaluation criteria accounted for that, the evaluation could focus more on substantive questions such as: How well do choral teachers hear and see musical issues and how successful are they at fixing those issues?
2. Teachers should be evaluated by someone with expertise in their area such as a more senior teacher, a department head, or a fine arts coordinator (in the case of music and choir). A principal who is experienced in social studies may feel comfortable critiquing a choral teachers’ classroom management, but they may have little to say regarding whether or not a teacher is adequately assessing a specific concept such as dynamics. Having a specialized observer may also help solve problems mentioned in point 1.
3. Evaluations can be derived from one source (e.g. Marzano, Danielson, etc.) but can also be altered to be unique to each different school community. Although this study did not explore this, choral programs often differ greatly depending on the size of the program, the size of the school, and whether the school is in an

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

urban, suburban, or rural community. A teacher of a high performing, well-established choral program will have different goals and expectations than a teacher of a brand new program; holding these teachers to the same standards may not be a meaningful choice. Furthermore, some researchers (Gerrity, 2009; Heffner, 2007) found that some music programs were negatively impacted through the addition of a new policy, thus resulting in less funding, lower enrollment, or less instructional time. A new or underfunded program could be at risk of becoming less stable or even totally eliminated if these programs are not accounted for in creating new policy.

4. Teachers should have input in what they are evaluated on and how they are evaluated. Marzano's Deliberate Practice model captured a bit of this. Teachers often know their strengths and weaknesses, so it would make sense for a teacher and their observer to establish a specific aspect to focus on over the course of a year. Additionally, Susie ran into the issue of being observed on a day when class did not function normally. If schools have a freer policy of when they are observed, I believe that they can be more successful.

While these goals might seem unrealistic or difficult to achieve, I believe that changes like these can make the evaluation process more personal for each teacher, which in turn can help each teacher be more successful. Personally, I don't mind that a principal with no music experience evaluates me; in fact, it can be extremely helpful for the non-musical teaching aspects such as classroom management. However, as a first year choir teacher, I often yearned for helpful feedback concerning content-specific aspects of my lessons.

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

Another consideration I would make for the future is to ask how these changes affect students. As both participants mentioned, teachers could do every lesson “by the book” and be an innovative teacher on paper. But if the overall performance by students is unsatisfactory, what happens to the learning objective? Teachers could be “innovative” in each domain and element, but the possibility remains that students could still be unsuccessful.

Recommendations

Between the results of the research and my own personal experiences, there is a lot more to be uncovered regarding how these policies affect choral classes. Although I intended to specifically study how Marzano’s policy was implemented, the actual problem seems to lie with Marzano’s policy itself. But additionally, it may not necessarily be a “Marzano” issue at all, but rather an overarching issue with any policy and the way it could be implemented. Lastly, there are clear implications for choral teachers, but it is possible that these implications carry over to other subjects as well.

One of the most troublesome limitations of this study was my own accessibility and the response rate of participants. Because I conducted research from out of state, my availability to come interview and observe face-to-face was limited to holidays and school breaks. Although the response rate would not have increased had my availability been more open, I most likely would have been able to interview at least one or two more teachers.

The issue of response rate could have been related to a variety of factors. In this particular county there are 20 high schools, many of which may have more than one choir teacher. But because I couldn’t find out who the choir teachers were at each school, I had to rely on the ones that I could find online. In the future, the use of snowball sampling

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

could be helpful in finding out who these teachers are. To make matters more difficult, I began contacting teachers around a difficult time of the school year: Thanksgiving, Christmas, and performance season. Furthermore, asking to observe a class and conduct an interview might have seemed like I was asking for a considerable amount of time. In the future, I would consider streamlining the process by conducting phone interviews or using online surveys.

The results of the interview could inform questions to be used on future research such as a widely-distributable survey. Using a survey could reach a larger and more diverse population, and it could be modified to include teachers in all areas. Surveys could be useful to compare experiences of music teachers versus non-music teachers, Marzano-informed policy versus other policy, and implementation methods. Additionally, after discovering how much of an impact administration played in implementation, a survey or interview could be designed solely for administrators to inquire about their perceptions on policy and implementation. Prior research can help inform procedures for seamless implementation for leadership. Bristo (2010) discussed personal qualities that principals should exhibit as outlined by Marzano; Keaveny (2013) uncovered how aspects of leadership were utilized when Marzano's evaluation framework was being implemented; and Gumm (1993) provided a multitude of choral teaching styles and behaviors. Work from Bristo and Keaveny can help solve problems if implementation goes awry; for example, if a principal hasn't displayed inspiration or flexibility. Alternatively, they can be used to inform administrators and teachers of the kinds of actions they should take before implementation takes place. Aspects from Gumm's research can be used to inform

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

evaluation criteria for choral teachers, especially if the evaluator is unfamiliar with aspects of choral teaching.

This study uncovered attitudes and perceptions of choir teachers, Susie and Jack, during and following the implementation of Marzano's teacher evaluation framework. The results provide evidence that while the framework has positive and helpful qualities, implementation could have gone more smoothly. Additionally, this study begs for more research in the realm of policy implementation. The world of education is ever-changing and as new policies and procedures are implemented and the status quo changes, teachers and administrators are bearing a huge responsibility to ensure that the process is as seamless as possible.

References

- Abril, C. R. & Bannerman, J. K. (2014). Perceived factors impacting school music programs. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 62(4), 344-361. doi: 10.1177/0022429414554430
- Abril, C. R. & Gault, B. (2008). The state of music in the secondary schools: The principal's perspective. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 56, 6-20. doi: 10.1177/0022429408317516
- Aguilar, C. E. (2011). *The development and application of a conceptual model for the analysis of policy recommendations for music education in the United States*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest. (3456436).
- Bell, C. L. (2003). Beginning the dialogue: Teachers respond to the national standards in music. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 156, 31-42. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40319172>
- Beveridge, T. (2010). No Child Left Behind and fine arts classes. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 111: 4-7. doi: 10.1080/1063290903228090
- Boyd, D., Grossman, P., Ing, M., Lankford, H., Loeb, S., & Wyckoff, J. (2010). The influence of school administrators on teacher retention decisions. *American Educational Research Journal*, 20(10), 1-31. doi: 10.3102/0002831210380788
- Bristo, B. J. (2010). *Principal and teacher perceptions of change implementation practices in 2007 and 2008 small learning communities grant recipient high schools in Florida* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest. (3415060).

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

- Byo, S. J. (1999). Classroom teachers' and music specialists' perceived ability to implement the national standards for music education. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 47(2), 111-123. doi: 10.2307/3345717
- Ciorba, C. R. & McLay, M. (2010). Describing Illinois music programs using The Whole School Effectiveness Guidelines Survey for music education: A statewide investigation. *Contributions to Music Education*, 37(1), 37-50.
- Coburn, C. E., Hill, H. C., & Spillane, J. P. (2016). Alignment and accountability in policy design and implementation: The common core state standards and implementation research. *Educational Researcher*, 45(4), 243-251. doi: 10.3102/0013189X16651080
- Collaborative Teams that Transform Schools. (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://www.marzanoresources.com/collaborative-teams-transform-schools-pd>
- Coulter, M. P. (2013). *A qualitative study of teacher and principal perceptions of Washington state teacher evaluation instruments: Danielson, Marzano, and CEL 5D+* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest. (3587064).
- Deliberate Practice Plan. (n.d.). Retrieved from http://www.marzanoevaluation.com/files/Deliberate%20Practice%20Plan_AllFra_meworks_FL_Version2_20120511.pdf
- Developing a Passion for Professional Teaching: The Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model. (2013). Retrieved from <https://www.learningsciences.com/wp/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/The-Marzano-Teacher-Evaluation-Model.pdf>

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

- Elpus, K. (2014). Evaluating the effect of No Child Left Behind on U.S. music course enrollments. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 62(3), 215-233. doi: 10.1177/0022429414530759
- Elpus, K. (2013). Music in the U.S. federal education policy: Estimating the effect of “core status” for music. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 114, 13-24. doi: 10.1080/10632913.213.744242
- Froehlich, H. & Frierson-Campbell, C. (2013). *Inquiry in music education: Concepts and methods for the beginning researcher*. Routledge.
- Heffner, C. J. (2007). The impact of high-stakes testing on curriculum, funding, instructional time, and student participation in music programs (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest. (3281531).
- Hourigan, R. (2011). Race to the top: Implications for professional development in arts education. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 113: 60-64. doi: 10.1080/10632913.2011.546679
- Gerrity, K. W. (2009). No Child Left Behind: Determining the impact of policy on music education in Ohio. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 179, 79-93. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40319331>
- Gumm, A. J. (1993). The development of a model and assessment instrument of choral music teaching styles. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 41(3), 181-199. doi: 10.2307/3345324
- Keaveny, S. M. (2013). *Implementing Marzano’s model: The reality of educational leadership and school reform* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest. (3606864).

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

- Kos, R. P. (2007). *Incidental change: The influence of educational policy implementation on music education programs and practice* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest. (3261425).
- Kos, R. P. (2017). Music education and the well-rounded education provision of the Every Student Succeeds Act: A critical policy analysis. *Arts Education Policy Review*. doi: 10.1080/10632913.2017.1327383
- Marzano, R. J. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.marzanoresources.com/robert-j-marzano>
- Marzano, R. J., Waters, T., & McNulty, B.A. (2005). *School leadership that works: From research to results*. Alexandria: Association for Supervision & Curriculum Development.
- The Marzano Focused Teacher Evaluation Model. (2017). Retrieved from <https://www.learningsciences.com/wp/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/Focus-Eval-Model-Overview-2017.pdf>
- Race to the Top Funding. (n.d.). Retrieved from www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop/index.html
- Richardson, L., & St. Pierre, E. A. (2005). Writing: A Method of Inquiry. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (p. 959–978). Sage Publications Ltd.
- Russell, J. A. & Austin, J. R. (2010). Assessment practices of secondary music teachers. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 58(1), 37-54. doi: 10.1177/0022429409360062

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

Shaw, R. D. (2018): Examining arts education policy development through policy frameworks. *Arts Education Policy Review*. doi:

10.1080/10632913.2018.1468840

Spohn, C. (2008). Teacher perspectives on No Child Left Behind and arts education: A case study. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 109:4, 3-12. doi:

10.3200/AEPR.109.4.3-12

Tracy, L. H. (2002). *Assessing individual students in the high school choral ensemble: Issues and practices*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest.

(3065486).

Vekeman, E., Devos, G., Tuytens, M. (2015). The influence of teachers' expectations on principals' implementation of a new teacher evaluation policy in Flemish secondary education. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, 27(2), 129-151. doi: 10.1007/s11092-014-9203-4

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

Appendix A: Recruitment Materials

The following is a script used in the initial email (sent in November, 2017), the second email (sent in December, 2017), and the final email (sent in February, 2018).

Subject: Invitation to Participant in Research Study (November, December)

Subject: Looking for interviewees for thesis on Marzano (February)

Dear Mr./Ms. [Teacher name],

I am a current graduate student at Indiana University, Bloomington and an alumnus of Orange County Public Schools. I am contacting you because I am researching policy and its effect in high school choral classrooms, and I am looking for participants willing to be interviewed and observed. Attached to this email is a Study Information Sheet and it contains information about the study and what you'd be expected to do, should you wish to participate. If there are any further questions that are not answered by the Study Information Sheet, I'd be happy to answer those over email.

No matter if you choose to participate or not, I would love to hear back from you. Thank you for taking the time to read this.

Sincerely,

Chelsea Brinda

MME, Music Education/MM, Music Theory

Indiana University, Bloomington

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

Appendix B: Interview Questions

1. Were you a teacher in this county prior to the introduction of Marzano?
 - a. If so, what were the challenges in making the change?
2. Can you describe what policies have been put into place that reflect Marzano's framework?
 - a. What has been changed, added, or taken away?
 - b. If you were a teacher in another county, describe the challenges in making the change.
3. Can you tell me a little bit about the impact that your school's use of Marzano's teacher evaluation, curriculum planning, or other policies may have had on your teaching practice?
 - a. Have these policies made any changes in what and how you teach on a daily basis?
 - b. Have they had any impact on the school community?
 - c. What do you perceive as a benefit due to the implementation?
 - d. What do you perceive as a drawback due to the implementation?
4. (If a new teacher), Can you describe how this framework differs from what you were taught in your undergraduate and/or graduate studies?
5. Can you describe any ways that you have been supported in using, or accommodating these policies?
 - a. other teachers
 - b. other faculty/administration
 - c. other county professionals

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

- d. Do you feel that you are still supported in using, or accommodating these policies?

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

Figure 2: Individual Professional Development Plan (IPDP)

INDIVIDUAL PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN for 2011 - 2012

TEACHER: _____ ADMINISTRATOR: _____ SCHOOL: _____

Focus (School Improvement Goal): To increase enrollment and performance in advanced programs in our underrepresented populations

Student Baseline Data	Needs-based Question for Professional Inquiry	Expected Student Achievement Goal(s)	Related Professional Development Objective(s)	Related Professional Training & Learning Activities	Classroom Implementation
What specific student achievement data indicates the need for improvement? (Indicated Classroom Level Data that is disaggregated by student performance level, gender, ethnicity, and/or socio-economic status.) 1. AP Enrollment and 2. AP Score Reports	In reflecting on this student achievement data, what instructional question(s) comes to mind? (Considering this specific student data, formulate a question that will help you improve your practice and student performance.) 1. How do we increase student enrollment in AP Music Theory? 2. What content of the AP Exam necessitates more emphasis?	What is your expectation of student achievement as a result of your professional development? (Indicate a measurable result on a specific assessment. Multiple data sources are encouraged.) 1. AP Music Theory class will increase enrollment to 20 students for 2012-13 (Current enrollment is 15 students) 2. There will be an increase on students passing the AP Music Theory Exam from last year to this year by 50%	What practice(s) will you need to enhance/develop in order to answer your question and meet your stated student achievement goals? (Indicate what <u>you</u> need to know and be able to do.) 1. I will need to recruit students from the guitar, keyboard, band, and chorus classes as well as other students not yet tapped who might play string instruments at UHS 2. I will study the AP Music Test in order to break it down for the students; I will read articles and strategies from AP Central; I will attend AP Music Theory Summer Institute	How will you use research-based knowledge and strategies that will help you achieve your stated professional development objective(s)? (List activities that you have planned for your personal professional learning.) 1. AP Music Theory Summer Institute 2011 2. Read Current and New edition of the textbook 3. Research new websites that will benefit student ear training	What practices have you implemented in your classroom as a result of your professional development? (Record new strategies as you implement in your classroom.) Attended AP Music Theory Summer Institute 2011

Documented Results: (Completed just prior to final review)

How do you plan to share what you've learned in the IPDP process? (Check all that apply.)

☐ Action Research Report ☐ Learning Community Sharing ☐ Sharing At A Workshop or Conference ☐ Web-based Sharing ☐ Dept. or Team Meeting ☐ Other _____

Initiation: _____ Date _____ Teacher Signature _____ Administrator Signature _____ Interim Review date(s)—Optional _____

IPDP Conferences: Final Review: _____ Date _____ Teacher Signature _____ Administrator Signature _____ Was the student achievement goal(s) accomplished?
☐ yes ☐ no ☐ to be continued

Comments: _____

OCPS1007Per (Revised 8/08)

Figure 3: Sample Lesson Plan

Lesson Plans **Week: Oct 23-27, 2017**

1st Women's Glee 2nd Period- Bel Canto 3rd Period-Chante 4th Period- AP Music Theory 5th Period-Vocal Techniques 7th Period—Concert Choir

Essential Question: Why use articulations?

Learning Goal:	Assessment:	Accommodation:	Other Strategies:
1. Students will be able to sing stepwise motion Solfege – Level 1 2. Students will understand and perform articulation markings.	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher observation <input type="checkbox"/> Solo/Small Group Performance <input type="checkbox"/> Quiz/Test <input type="checkbox"/> Self-evaluation <input type="checkbox"/> Writing assignment <input type="checkbox"/> Concert Performance <input type="checkbox"/> Worksheet <input type="checkbox"/> Rubric/Checklist <input type="checkbox"/> Other Sound Recording	<input type="checkbox"/> Extra time <input type="checkbox"/> Peer tutoring <input type="checkbox"/> Advance Organizers <input type="checkbox"/> Model, Demonstration <input type="checkbox"/> Preferential Seating <input type="checkbox"/> Test item samples <input type="checkbox"/> Compare/Contrast <input type="checkbox"/> Visual Aids <input type="checkbox"/> Small Group	<input type="checkbox"/> Audio Recording <input type="checkbox"/> Practice <input type="checkbox"/> Hand sings <input type="checkbox"/> Listening <input type="checkbox"/> Aural decoding <input type="checkbox"/> Visual decoding <input type="checkbox"/> Audiation <input type="checkbox"/> Main idea <input type="checkbox"/> Choral Reading
Scale for Learning Goal #1 4 – I can sing any piece of music on Solfege 3 – I can sing Level 1 solfege perfectly 2 – I can sing Level 1 with some errors 1 – I am learning how to sing in solfege Entry-What is Solfege?	Scale for Learning Goal #2 4 – I understand and perform dynamic, articulation and tempo markings 3 – I understand and perform all dynamic and articulation markings 2 – I understand and perform some dynamic and articulation markings 1 – I know the dynamic markings	D1: Elements 4, 5, 8, 18, 21 Standards: LAFS.910.RST.2.4, DA.912.S.2.1, MU.S.3.5	

Activities	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
Classroom Management	• Uniform-Mrs. pulls aside students to talk with them • Fundraising \$ & orders due Wednesday	• All-County recording due Sun Oct 29 • Fundraising orders and \$ due tomorrow	• All-County recording due Sun Oct 29 • Fundraising orders and \$ due today	• Quiz tomorrow • Uniform Payment reminder	• Quiz • Uniform payment reminder
Warm-ups	Articulations: Accent, staccato, tenuto, slur, legato, (playing-marcato, wedge)	Vocalizes-Ms. Rhythm, Meter, measures, bar lines, double bar lines, note value- Dotted eighth and dotted quarter, Dynamic markings	Articulations: Accent, staccato, tenuto, slur, legato, (playing-marcato, wedge)	Vocalizes-Ms. Sectional, Rhythm, Meter, measures, bar lines, double bar lines, note value- Dotted eighth and dotted quarter	Vocalizes-Ms. Articulations: Accent, staccato, tenuto, slur, legato, (playing-marcato, wedge)
Rehearsal Music and/or Activities	I. Articulations teach II. Solfege-FVA L1: 5-6 III. All-County – ask for students who might be interested in auditioning. Then Mrs. explains process to those students IV. Rehearsal • <i>Hallelujah</i> quiz this Friday for half of the song • <i>Wassail</i>	I. Review articulation markings II. Rhythm- Quarter, Half, whole, dotted quarter MPA L3 III. Rehearsal-Sectionals • <i>La Bonne Nouvelle</i> • <i>Hallelujah Chorus</i> • <i>Wassail</i>	I. Review articulation markings and perform these II. Solfege: SSA easy III. Rehearsal: • <i>Hallelujah</i> • <i>Wassail</i>	I. Review articulation markings II. Rhythm –MPA L3 III. Sectionals Mrs. : Candlelight students Mr. : Sopranos Mrs. : Altos • <i>La Bonne Nouvelle</i> • <i>Hallelujah Chorus</i> • <i>Wassail</i>	I. Quiz on articulation markings II. Solfege MPA 3-part easy III. Rehearsal • <i>Hallelujah</i> quiz on half the song

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

Figure 4: Sample Deliberate Practice Plan

Deliberate Practice

Domain 1: Classroom Strategies and Behaviors

Design Question 4: What will I do to help students generate and test hypothesis about new knowledge.

Element 22: Engaging students in cognitively complex tasks involving hypothesis generation and testing.

Essential Question: How does generating a hypothesis on the composer's intent help us?

Learning Goal: Students will generate and test a hypothesis regarding composer's intent in arranging music for chorus.

Rubric:

4	I can generate and test hypothesis regarding music theory in classical music.
3	I can generate and test a hypothesis regarding composer's intent in arranging music for chorus
2	I can generate a hypothesis regarding composer's intent
1	I can generate a hypothesis
Entry	I understand what hypothesis means

Materials/Technology: Computer, DocCam, pencils, paper, students cell phones

I. Vocalizes

II. Review to Hypothesis generation and testing

A. Introduce the Learning Goal

B. Assess where they are with the Rubric

C. Review generating and testing hypothesis using Lissette's example of frizzy hair

III. Generating Hypothesis regarding composer's intent in arranging music for chorus

A. Show Flamenco video <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=X5hmujkAc4g>

Before watching video, ask students to listen for what types of instruments, use of percussion or body percussion

B. You will now generate a hypothesis

1. Divide into groups of 2s. Decide who is Recording Artist 1 and who is Recording Artist 2

2. Recording Artist 1 (RA1) gets a piece of paper, pencil / Recording Artist 2 (RA2) gets *El Vito*. RA1 writes/RA2 shares with class

3. This is a timed-activity. You will have only 6 minutes.

4. Make hypothesis guided by these statements:

- Predict what instrument sound the piano arrangement is supposed to replicate in the Flamenco (especially measures 3-9)
- Predict what the left hand of the piano replicates in the dance
- Predict what the right hand of the piano is replicating in measures 19-34
- Predict if the hand claps added to the music will be effective in replicating the authenticity of the dance or will it take away?
- "Hoja Lata" is a metal, as thin as I coke can. Will there be something added or taken away to the music to suggest metal?
- Predict places of suspense in the music based on the text- page number

C. Activity - Teacher circulates

D. Ask students for answers to the questions

V. Hypothesis Testing

A. Let's test our hypotheses. Listen to the piano arrangement and stop to discuss the answers. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wIVaks36fig>

B. Were your hypothesis completely accurate and without bias? How else could we know for certain? (Asking the composer)

D. Ultimately, how does hypothesis help us understand the composer's intent?

VI. According to our goal, where are you on the scale now?

Instructions for Generating and Testing Hypothesis

1. Divide into groups of 2s. Decide who is Recording Artist 1 and who is Recording Artist 2

2. Recording Artist 1 (RA1) gets a piece of paper, pencil / Recording Artist 2 (RA2) gets *El Vito*. RA1 writes/RA2 shares with class

3. This is a timed-activity. You will have only 6 minutes.

4. Make hypothesis guided by these statements:

1. I predict that the piano is supposed to replicate _____ in the Flamenco Dance. (Look at measures 3-9)

2. I predict that the left hand of the piano replicates _____
_____ in the dance.

3. My hypothesis is that the right hand in measures 19-34 replicates the _____
_____ in the dance.

4. Our hypothesis is that the claps _____ in replicating the authenticity of the flamenco dance.

5. I predict that there will be something _____
in the music to suggest a metal sound.

6. I predict that page _____, measures _____ will be suspenseful because _____

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

Appendix D: Codes and Categories

<u>Quote</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Category according to research questions</u>	<u>School Code</u>
Actually, you'll find out that I'm not against Marzano	Not against Marzano	Attitudes/perceptions	1
The problem with this one is that it affects your pay.	Teacher pay	Changes	1
It's not seniority, it's actually how effective you are as a teacher.	Effectiveness vs. seniority	Changes	1
The teacher's union don't really advocated for it and have made some strides in success and I think they would like to see it all gone.	Union wants it gone	Attitudes/perceptions, support	1
And whatever they got was how you were seen as.	FCAT, evaluation	Changes	1
So it was 65 or 60/40 and then that was your score and that's how you got paid.	Teacher pay	Changes	1
But you put in my class a kid that has never taken music in an AP music theory class and all of a sudden, I have to teach calculus to a person that has never had math. And that is not fair. He's not going to pass, you know? Maybe one	Tests don't account for student motivation	Challenges	1

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

or two pass, but you know, I have tutoring but I cannot mandate for them to come to tutoring. I call the parents, and I say this is not doing well, I have tutoring after school. And they say, "Okay." So they come one time and then they don't come anymore.			
Yeah I, um, I get penalized because they don't want to take the tests.	Tests don't account for student motivation	Challenges	1
They know that I mentor interns, so on the mentorship, there's, mine is innovative. But that's after two years ago they put me on applying, and I had to go to the principal and I had, by that time I had three back-to-back, every semester I had an intern. And I went to her and I go, "I don't know what a mentorship means for Marzano." If having an intern that you're mentoring every single day doesn't count for it, it's not like I'm mentoring once a	Confusion, lack of clarity	Support, challenges	1

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

week and in PLC because I am the chair of that department or that I have done a workshop and I'm preparing for that workshop. It's a day-to-day mentorship. And she goes, "Oh, I forgot."			
But unless you ask me, you don't know I have mentors.	Confusion, lack of clarity	Support, challenges	1
So that part of the evaluation in which, unless they really are asking teachers and really asking students, it's just based on what they see at that point in time when they come in.	Doesn't show full picture	Benefits/drawbacks, challenges	1
Well, they have to do it more than one. There's a formal evaluation that is once. And then there's, I think it's two informal evaluations, it depends on the category of teacher you are. Like if it's new, you have more, and if it's, if you have been a teacher for so many years, it's another category.	Frequency of evaluation	Changes	1

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

And if you're deficient then you get to have more.			
Yeah, she listens. And she has changed, she has changed her rating. That day when I, two years ago, when I said we have three in a row, she goes, "You haven't signed it, have you?" My final evaluation. She said, "You haven't signed it then I can still change it."	Helpful, understanding admin	Support	1
The assistant principal did an informal evaluation and uh, it was one of those days that we're saying the fundraiser items, they're giving the spiel about the fundraiser and all of that and she gave me something from applying, because the rubric did not match what I was doing. The rubric on the goal on the rubric on the board did not match what I was doing. And I go, "Are you kidding?" I was so mad. This is the one day, I mean this rubric over	Frustration, admin	Changes, challenges, support	1

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

here is for the unit for the week. This is the one day I don't have. And she didn't like, she didn't say, "Oh, I see" or anything like that. She said, "You should've changed the goal and the rubric for that day." I was so mad.			
And then from then on, every time there is something um, the day after MPA I usually do, we evaluate and the next day we clean. We clean the classroom because it has been like, like everything, everything, everything...so I put the rubric: I will take pride in our classroom, the classroom and what it means to all of the family. And then the rubric is #1: I do not care, everybody else should clean but not me. #2 is: I will do one thing for the good of the whole. #3: the goal itself: I will, y'know. And then #4: I will go above and beyond and	Spiting admin	Attitudes/perceptions, changes	1

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

ask for more things that can be done to clean this room. They know that this is what we're doing today.			
But this principal, our principal, she understands. She goes, "Okay, I'll come another day."	Helpful, understanding admin	Support	1
"I will do something different, I will evaluate something different." - Principal	Helpful, understanding admin	Support	1
And it doesn't really match that, it matches, but we say it differently in our way of being...and I think the principal would be able to catch that kind of more training, observation, than other faculty.	Certain faculty more knowledgeable	Support	1
Same.	All teachers have same evaluation rubrics	Changes	1
So you take a survey of where you are, doesn't affect this is where you are on each of these elements and then out of those that are the lowest, you choose one that you're gonna deliberately work on.	Deliberate practice/self-evaluation	Changes	1

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

How do you do hypotheses in chorus?	Fitting model to music class	Changes, challenges	1
So I came up with stuff and this actually once I'm there it's like, "Oh I can do this, we do this all the time, we just haven't called it that."	Already do Marzano	Changes, benefits/drawbacks	1
So I put the MPA, All-State sight-reading on the board. And I go especially to the advanced choirs and say, "which of these measures do you or the class as a whole do you think would have trouble with?" You're making a hypothesis as to which one would be difficult for us. And then, so we...and then we go ahead and do it. And we say, "who really had problems with this? Did the class as a whole? Did some people? Did the majority of you?" So your hypothesis was correct.	Already do Marzano	Changes, benefits/drawbacks	1
Right. It's just naming it that way.	Already do Marzano	Changes, benefits/drawbacks	1
Cause we do that all, I mean I've	Already do Marzano	Changes, benefits/drawbacks	1

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

done that in the past.			
If you know that as we go through it that measure is gonna be more difficult, you should go to that measure and pick it apart and know how to tackle that. So and then it was based on our hypothesis what things could be done to minimize that effect.	Already do Marzano	Changes, benefits/drawbacks	1
How do you think...we read the lyrics of a piece of music. And then what do you think the music, what the composer would do with this. Or the opposite. Here's the music, no words. What do you think the words are gonna be based on this, what would be about.	Already do Marzano	Changes, benefits/drawbacks	1
Anytime there is something new, there's gonna be a challenge.	Resistant to change	Attitudes/perceptions	1
People like what they have, they're used to it, so a new system with you have to do something different, prepare	Resistant to change	Attitudes/perceptions	1

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

your lesson plans like they have for a long time now, especially people that have the same subject.			
You have already done this. But now you have to do it differently.	Already do Marzano/same thing done differently	Changes, benefits/drawbacks	1
So if you look at mine, it has to have the goal and the rubric, it has to have the essential question, it has to have the elements, it has to have which domain, which elements.	Lesson plan	Changes	1
So you see, I did my own, it's the way that I used to do it, I just add more boxes.	Same thing done differently	Changes, benefits/drawbacks	1
I like, I welcome change. I am not stuck in the past.	Not resistant to change	Attitudes/perceptions	1
So for me, it was hard, but it wasn't an impossible thing to do.	Not resistant to change	Attitudes/perceptions	1
Nothing that I'm gonna quit over; some people did.	Quitting	Attitudes/perceptions	1
And so a lot of people that first year said, "I'm just gonna retire."	Quitting	Attitudes/perceptions	1
It also came with the technology changes at the same time.	Technology	Changes	1
You have to do things online, you	Online/technology	Changes	1

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

have to submit things online.			
Last year we, all high schools became digital.	Online/technology	Changes	1
All high schools, a student has iPad or a laptop or something. So that was another change.	Online/technology	Changes	1
Like teaching the students how to do your homeworks it took so long.	Online/technology/frustration	Changes, attitudes/perceptions	1
I don't think the technology aspect is part of Marzano.	Technology not a result of Marzano	Changes	1
You had like 3 days of workshops.	Workshops	Changes	1
And then even after that there were two days that they would pay you to come and do lesson plans, but I was on vacation and they always tell you too late and I had already planned my vacation.	Workshops	Changes	1
It bothers me that every year they change to something new.	Frustration	Attitudes/perceptions	1
The evaluation system has changed based on Marzano.	Teacher evaluation	Changes	1
The part of it being our own teaching and the other part being the student growth.	Teacher evaluation	Changes	1

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

It was first FCAT, and then everybody was supposedly teaching towards the reading, towards the math, towards...and so our individual plans have to do with how do you teach reading in your content area.	Teacher evaluation, FCAT	Changes, challenges	1
And people said, "Well I don't even reading and math, why should I be held accounted for that?"	Teacher evaluation, content area	Changes, challenges	1
Then the county had to then create EOC, end of the year exams, and then they have changed like the final exam....I don't know, they changed something	End-of-year exam (EOC)	Changes	1
So now chorus I, II, III, IV has an exam at the end and it is based on that exam that is your growth based.	End-of-year exam (EOC)	Changes	1
Like I have in concert choir I have kids that are in the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th so they will take different chorus exams. So that day, "Chorus II people, this is your exam. Chorus III people, there is	End-of-year exam (EOC)	Changes	1

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

your exam. Chorus IV people, these are your exams."			
All of the teachers in the county were asked, mandated really to go and give in the time to write the course progression test.	Teachers writing tests	Changes	1
So the first year that that came out, our students did really poorly.	Poor student performance	Challenges	1
And I go, "I know I'm teaching. What's wrong with this picture?"	Poor student performance	Challenges	1
So it made me go, just generalize what they give you that's what's gonna be on the test, and it's like...just like SAT, you don't know what it is, but at least I have an SAT Barron's Book.	Teaching to test/teaching to evaluation	Challenges	1
So I have, what has changed my way of teaching so that I hit a lot more of this for this year.	Teaching to test/teaching to evaluation	Changes, challenges	1
context Exactly.	No way to teach to test	Challenges	1
So you can teach the concepts and you can teach the skills. They do give you, they're like, this is, these are the things covered like the standards that are gonna be covered.	Not knowing what's on exams	Challenges	1

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

Okay, the students will learn how to sight-read, learn to read music. And be able to apply it.	Broad standards	Changes	1
It's the same thing, but now you have to add another layer of that.	More work to teach in different ways	Benefits/drawbacks, challenges	1
We had to do PLC's, professional learning communities, and which are defined by different, different ways by different administrators in different ways.	Professional learning communities	Changes	1
Another thing that changed was the pay and how that was going to be calculated.	Teacher pay	Changes	1
I think that year when we started, you were no longer tenured	No tenure	Changes	1
So now people that come in, their yearly contracts they're not tenured after. I was still tenured because I just was grandfathered in. But my colleague is not. So everybody is by year. So you can be dismissed.	No tenure	Changes	1
The way in we did our lesson plans.	Lesson plan	Changes	1
The way in which we talk.	Communication	Changes	1

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

For me, a benefit was although I know what my goal is, now I was telling my students what the goal was.	Stating goals	Benefits/drawbacks	1
So I was telling them so that they'd go, "I don't know anything about it" or "I already know some of it" or "I'm already there." But then other people are not.	Stating goals	Benefits/drawbacks	1
But if not, it's just things to learn without an ending goal and I think every human likes to have a purpose for learning.	Stating goals/purposeful learning	Benefits/drawbacks	1
Well, telling the students what the goal was and having them assess themselves and for me to actually be aware of where every kid is.	Stating goals	Benefits/drawbacks	1
Um...most people will be negative.	Negative impact on school community	Support	1
Um, and I know my school will be negative.	Negative impact on school community	Support	1
I'm gonna teach what I'm gonna teach, I just, I'm learning their lingo and I use the lingo.	Not resistant to change	Attitudes/perceptions	1
It's not a problem for me.	Not resistant to change	Attitudes/perceptions	1
I just continue what I'm gonna teach.	Not resistant to change	Attitudes/perceptions	1

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

Most people are negative. Most people don't want change.	Resistant to change	Attitudes/perceptions	1
And if you bring another evaluation system, they're going to block that one.	Resistant to change	Attitudes/perceptions	1
Yeah, it was about the pay.	Teacher pay	Changes	1
Yeah, they have all been supportive.	Helpful, understanding admin	Support	1
I mean the fact that they gave you books, that they do training, um even for the music people, the county has given you know training also and Scott Evans and their team have given training.	Ample training opportunities	Support	1
With each other, we have, we have each other.	Support among teachers	Support	1
They have given resources and time um, if I need to and I say I don't understand this, they'll give me time to go and observe somebody	Helpful, understanding admin	Support	1
I know my principal brought principals to come and observe me because she liked the way that I did the goals and the rubrics because I want them to	Helpful, understanding admin	Support	1

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

<p>observe what is real teaching of this rather than a dog and pony show, that's what she called it...as soon as I get there, "and what is that, a 4-3-2-1" versus mine was a process and it wasn't like sprung on them just because an administrator was there...so um the fact that she also praised me was, it's a way of saying good job, I see that you're doing it.</p>			
<p>Me helping others, I have said that I would share my deliberate practice with other people so that they see "does that help you, can you do it" and I share mine with my colleague so that he can use mine and tailor it to what he's teaching. It's our community of fine arts people are very helpful and chorus people are really, in this county we're not like "no this is mine you cannot use it." We help each other.</p>	Support among teachers	Support	1

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

Well in terms of technology, yes.	Helpful, understanding admin	Support	1
In terms of Marzano, well the fact that I can talk to the principal and tell her "you didn't realize that I had mentors," I think is good...depending on what she says.	Helpful, understanding admin	Support	1
But if you don't say anything, they're not gonna know.	Must be outspoken	Support	1
But she wouldn't have known about mentors because that's not something I say, "and today, I'm bringing this person."	Must be outspoken	Support	1
We also have a performance aspect, so we have to do MPA.	Performance aspect	Benefits/drawbacks, challenges	1
And which, if I only have "goods," you know, they might be brainy, but they cannot do it.	Performance aspect	Benefits/drawbacks, challenges	1
You know, they might know everything on book and present something to you, but skill-wise, they cannot produce it.	Performance aspect	Benefits/drawbacks, challenges	1
So for us, as a performing aspect of it that is not accounted for on a test.	Performance aspect	Benefits/drawbacks, challenges	1

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

I was a teacher in another county in Florida prior to the introduction of Marzano.	Prior to Marzano	Changes	2
They didn't and then my second year, they turned it, they went to Marzano.	Prior to Marzano	Changes	2
Well, before it used to be about actual teaching.	Actual teaching	Changes	2
And now it's about Marzano, like checking off these boxes you're supposed to check off.	Checking off boxes	Changes	2
That...I don't know, I have a real problem with it as you can probably tell.	Negative perspective	Attitudes/perceptions	2
Especially in this classroom because a lot of the stuff, I feel that we do Marzano stuff in here probably more than they do in other classes.	Already do Marzano	Benefits/drawbacks, challenges	2
Because a lot of Marzano stuff is like constant feedback, having the kids rank themselves, or like y'know on a scale of 1 to whatever how did you think you did on this assignment.	Facets of Marzano	Changes	2
Here, we do that literally all the time.	Already do Marzano	Benefits/drawbacks, challenges	2

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

So, I understand why Marzano is good, too because it's probably really good practice.	Positive outlook	Attitudes/perceptions	2
I just don't think it should be used as an evaluation tool, if that makes sense.	Teacher evaluation	Changes	2
So like, yeah, it's good practice to get the kids to tell you feedback on their own performance and it's good practice for you as a teacher to y'know, look at that stuff as see what can I do here to get the kids more engaged.	Positive outlook	Attitudes/perceptions	2
But I feel like in here and in band and stuff we do that anyway.	Already do Marzano	Benefits/drawbacks, challenges	2
Yeah, I feel like we constantly assess.	Student assessment	Benefits/drawbacks, challenges	2
So Marzano fits really good into music rehearsal classroom I think.	Good fit for music	Benefits/drawbacks, challenges	2
The frustration comes when they try to fit the Marzano check boxes they have for all of the core subjects into our stuff and they don't say, Well you're already doing this, it's just a different way.	Frustration, already do Marzano	Benefits/drawbacks, challenges	2

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

It's more like if they would just understand that what we do in here literally lines up perfectly with the Marzano stuff, and let it be and like saw that it works rather than saying, "Oh yeah, I see that you constantly assess, but I need you to constantly assess this way."	Good fit for music, need to fit Marzano model	Benefits/drawbacks, challenges	2
But it doesn't work.	Doesn't work	Benefits/drawbacks, challenges	2
You're not doing math problems where you can take the kids' papers and...that's not how we do things in here.	Fitting model to choir class	Benefits/drawbacks, challenges	2
So that's what's frustrating.	Frustration	Attitudes/perceptions	2
The good news is, when I get evaluated, I do real well because in practice, it looks great.	Teacher evaluation	Changes	2
Everything's changed.	Changes	Changes	2
You can see I don't do it, like I'm supposed to have all the learning crap on my board.	Rebelling	Attitudes/perceptions	2
The daily this and the learning goal and the scales.	Facets of Marzano	Changes	2
I don't do any of that.	Rebelling	Attitudes/perceptions	2

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

That's 100% different. Like, night and day different.	Teacher evaluation	Changes	2
The evaluation used to be: is he making eye contact with the kids, is he keeping the kids engaged, is he...it was more about the person-stuff and like the classroom management stuff and the nonmeasurable...I don't know if that makes any sense.	Prior to Marzano	Changes	2
And now Marzano is about: did he ask this, check this off. If I asked a kid what's this about, can they give me the answer, check off.	Checking off boxes	Changes	2
It's a lot more like, how do I say specific, it's a lot more like data-driven.	Data-driven, teacher evaluation	Changes	2
Yeah, results-oriented, data-driven, rather than the unmeasurable stuff that really makes a good teacher a good teacher.	Data-driven, teacher evaluation	Changes	2
It used to be you could walk in a classroom and you could know a good teacher when you see it.	Prior to Marzano	Changes	2

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

Now it's, "Oh, they're a great teacher, but they didn't do this, this, this, this, this, this, so therefore their evaluation is...they didn't do well."	Teacher evaluation	Changes	2
It's just like when you say you're teaching the kids for the test.	Teaching to test; teaching to evaluation	Changes	2
Instead of teaching them things you think they need, you're teaching them the way you know they're gonna score well on and that's what's happening with Marzano.	Teaching to test; teaching to evaluation	Changes, challenges	2
Because their pay depends on it now.	Teacher pay	Changes	2
So if I don't do, if I don't, when they come and observe me, I do write all that crap on the board.	Teacher evaluation	Changes, challenges	2
And then the next day, I erase it.	Rebelling	Attitudes/perceptions	2
Because it doesn't mean anything to the kids.	Meaningless to students	Benefits/drawbacks, challenges	2
So, but I want to get a good evaluation because I want to make more money.	Teacher pay	Changes	2
I feel like good teachers are good teachers whether or not this Marzano stuff, you	Not indicative of good teaching	Benefits/drawbacks, challenges	2

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

know a good teacher.			
Y'know, and I don't know if it's always measurable.	Not indicative of good teaching	Benefits/drawbacks, challenges	2
Me, personally? None. I'm serious. Cause I'm not...zero. Absolutely nothing.	No impact on previous teaching	Changes	2
Except having to adapt sometimes when we're being evaluated, yeah then I'll tweak a couple of things.	Teacher evaluation	Changes	2
But I'm not, I know I'm a good teacher and I'm not changing the way I do things.	No impact on previous teaching	Changes	2
Marzano be damned.	Negative perspective	Attitudes/perceptions	2
context No.	No impact on previous teaching	Changes	2
Yes. A negative impact. A huge negative impact.	Negative impact on school community	Support	2
I mean I guess the way maybe we've had a change is we have to try and figure out ways now to fit a square peg into a round hole.	Fitting Marzano model, school community	Challenges, support	2
So, we're in our meetings, and rather than talking about stuff that actually would be beneficial, we're trying to figure out how we can line	Fitting Marzano model, school community	Challenges, support	2

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

up with whatever they want to see us line up with.			
So, now it's just a matter of....in spite of Marzano.	Spiting	Attitudes/perceptions	2
So now it's instead of us sitting around and having actual productive meetings about the students, we have to sit around have productive meetings about how what we do, we can adapt to fit into this stupid y'know evaluation model.	Fitting Marzano model, school community	Challenges, support	2
There are some benefits.	Positive outlook	Attitudes/perceptions, benefits/drawbacks	2
I mean, I think like I said before, like I think it's good practice.	Positive outlook	Attitudes/perceptions	2
If people read the book, and like looked at what he's talking about and the things he was trying, what his research showed, they're all good things, I mean it's obvious.	Positive outlook	Attitudes/perceptions	2
If you tell a kid what they're supposed to learn before they learn it, then they know what to listen for, it's obvious that they're gonna, y'know what I'm saying?	Positive outlook	Attitudes/perceptions	2

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

Writing it on the board...we've been doing that...we'll tell them, "Guys, we're gonna run through this section again, and but I want you to really listen for the vowels."	Already do Marzano	Benefits/drawbacks, challenges	2
And good teachers have been writing that on the board for years.	Already do Marzano	Benefits/drawbacks, challenges	2
You know, so I think in practice, it's good practice.	Good practice, positive outlook	Attitudes/perceptions	2
I think in evaluation, it's a terrible evaluation model.	Teacher evaluation	Changes, attitudes/perceptions	2
Which is what he himself said. He said he himself...Marzano said it should never be used as an evaluation tool. And now we're using it as an evaluation tool.	Teacher evaluation	Attitudes/perceptions	2
He – now he's making millions of dollars, so I'm sure he doesn't mind.	Bitterness	Attitudes/perceptions	2
We got the book, we got the...what's it called? The something Teacher. The Effective Educator.	Resources	Support	2

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

We've got what they call the placemat that has all these different domains that we're supposed to like, y'know.	Domains	Changes	2
We have to do this – this is something else that's changed – now at the beginning of the year we have to do this thing called deliberate practice.	Deliberate practice	Changes	2
It used to be called Individual Professional Development Plan, IPDP, where basically you have to do this at the beginning of the year.	Individual professional development plan (IPDP)	Changes	2
You say, this is the stuff I'm gonna work on this year and try to better myself and learn and then you evaluate yourself at the end of the year.	IPDP teacher self-evaluation	Changes	2
Now, you have to go through and pick these Marzano-like domains that you're gonna like focus on this year.	Deliberate practice, teacher self-evaluation	Changes	2
And when they evaluate you, they're evaluating whether or not you are hitting your whatever applying	Teacher evaluation, deliberate practice	Changes	2

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

or effectively doing the benchmarks you picked at the beginning of the year.			
Which is so dumb.	Negative perspective	Attitudes/perceptions	2
Because that's one tiny little piece of what you do all day.	Teacher evaluation, just a snapshot	Benefits/drawbacks, challenges	2
That's the thing, they come and evaluate you on if you're meeting your deliberate practice that you picked at the beginning of the year.	Deliberate practice	Changes	2
Last year, my deliberate practice was "with-it-ness" - that's what I picked.	Deliberate practice	Changes	2
Now, "with-it-ness" is, am I with it enough to notice if a kid's off task, or do I know what's going on over there while I'm working over here. Obviously I do, they're all standing in front of me. But I don't on a daily basis go out of my way to like make sure I document and address it.	Deliberate practice; not always practical	Benefits/drawbacks, challenges	2
But when she's in the room, I sure as heck do. "Hey what're you doing,	Teaching to evaluation	Benefits/drawbacks, challenges	2

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

why are you talking over there? Guys, I need you to focus..." I'm redirecting.			
Now, there are some days where I don't want to break my momentum as a teacher and I'll ignore it.	Not always practical	Benefits/drawbacks, challenges	2
But that day I don't.	Teaching to evaluation	Benefits/drawbacks, challenges	2
So it's like, you're having to just adapt and fit your, fit what you're doing into the Marzano model.	Fitting Marzano model	Benefits/drawbacks, challenges	2
Which is frustrating.	Frustration	Attitudes/perceptions	2
It turns you from, it turns some teachers, now I don't think in us it's that bad because what we do is Marzano pretty much every day, constant assessment, constant feedback, asking them...	Good fit for music	Benefits/drawbacks, challenges	2
...but in other subjects, I can see how it might sterilize the, it might sterilize everything and just make it more data-driven, this kind of stuff and a lot of the intangibles might be ignored.	Not a perfect fit for all subjects	Benefits/drawbacks, challenges	2

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

People just start checking boxes off to check boxes off, I think you lose something.	Checking off boxes	Benefits/drawbacks, challenges	2
It'd be like doing music without any emotion but you're doing all the dynamics on the page.	Data-driven, not enough focus on content	Benefits/drawbacks, challenges	2
But I mean they teach you how to teach, how to write curriculum, how to actually be a teacher, how to manage a classroom.	College experience	Benefits/drawbacks, challenges	2
And I mean when you do the student teaching, you go in there and you watch a master teacher teach, and you pick up the stuff and they help you, but they're never talking about, "Listen you need to work on domain 4."	Aspects of policy not addressed in college	Benefits/drawbacks, challenges	2
Well, the admin is great here. Like we're very lucky.	Helpful, understanding admin	Support	2
And a lot of it, this is something else people, you'll realize if you talk to more people: it all depends on your admin.	Experience depends on admin	Support	2
Like for example: when I was at the old high school I was at in ****	Previous experience	Support	2

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

County, everyone got "highly effective." Everyone. Every single teacher.			
Because the principal didn't want to deal with teachers coming and complaining that they didn't get their raise because they weren't...so he would just give out "highly effective" to everybody.	Admin at previous school	Support	2
And then the county saw that like 98% of our county - because every principal did that - was all highly effective and they're like, "This is a problem cause kids are failing all kinds of stuff, they're doing horrible on the FCATs, so you can't all be highly effective."	Teacher evaluation mismatched with standardized test scores	Support	2
So then the next year, no one got "highly effective."	Nobody was highly effective	Support	2
It's so stupid.	Negative perspective	Attitudes/perceptions	2
And then here, I was highly effective last year, two years before that I was not, and then this year my first evaluation, I didn't get "innovating," I got like "applying."	Teacher evaluation, ratings		2

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

Which is like one level below the highest level.			
That's how they rate you: are you innovating or are you just applying the stuff.	Teacher evaluation, ratings	Support	2
And when I asked my assistant principal - and I love her, by the way, this isn't her fault - but when I asked her why didn't I get innovating, she didn't give me a straight answer.	Confusion, lack of clarity	Support	2
Right? What's innovating supposed to be? Like you coming up with something on the spot. That's another part of the problem too, like we can't even define what innovating is. They can't either. So they're like, "Oh we're going to evaluate you, we want to see you get an innovating on this." But yet no one can tell you what that looks like or means.	Confusion, lack of clarity	Support	2
So like, and I remember the day she came in. The sopranos couldn't, they were singing something wrong	Teacher evaluation, innovation	Challenges, support	2

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

or flat, I don't remember. But I told them to do something physically, which I've never told them before, like it just popped in my head like.... like today, I said, "Don't sing sharp like my hair, sing like Lance's hair nice and poofy." I've never said that before. And it worked. So to me, that's innovating. Because I innovated an idea that they got, on the spot, that I hadn't planned, but I wouldn't get innovating for some reason because of that.			
Why would we do something different than what works if we know what works?	Impractical		2
To get higher ratings.	Teaching to evaluation	Benefits/drawbacks, challenges	2
You might be in a voice lesson and you might have one teacher say to you the same thing over and over again and then another teacher comes in and says the exact same thing but like in a different way and	Innovation	Benefits/drawbacks, challenges	2

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

you suddenly get it.			
Once for 10 minutes.	Teacher evaluation, frequency	Benefits/drawbacks, challenges	2
She doesn't know if you've never said that before.	Teacher evaluation, only a snapshot	Benefits/drawbacks, challenges	2
She doesn't know if you just came up with that off the top of your head because it just popped in there and you're a good teacher and you're figuring out what to say to make the kid get it.	Teacher evaluation, only a snapshot	Benefits/drawbacks, challenges	2
I'm like, "Why didn't I get innovating?" "Well I don't know if you've ever said that before, how am I supposed to know." And I'm like well, I never have.	Innovation, only a snapshot	Benefits/drawbacks, challenges	2
So that's what's frustrating.	Frustration	Attitudes/perceptions	2
And they know we're going to do our jobs, not because we fit Marzano, but because they see our results.	Helpful, understanding admin	Support	2
The admin here is great and they're like, "Whatever, I don't care that you don't have stuff on the board, just do your job."	Results vs. ratings	Support	2
Yeah there are some observations	Teacher evaluation, frequency	Changes	2

PERCEPTIONS OF CHOIR TEACHERS

that are announced and some that aren't.			
It's not measurable, that's what I'm trying to get at.	Not always measurable	Benefits/drawbacks, challenges	2
I'm very supported in my choice to ignore it.	Helpful, understanding admin	Support	2